

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXX

February 1933

NUMBER 3

ETUDES SUR JEAN RENART

I. SUR LA DATE DU ROMAN DE L'ESCOUFLE

IL EST universellement admis aujourd'hui que l'auteur de l'*Escoufle* est Jean Renart qui a aussi écrit le *Lai de l'ombre*, *Guillaume de Dôle*, et *Galeran*. Ceci a été suffisamment démontré par les travaux de F. M. Warren, Joseph Bédier et Ch.-V. Langlois.¹ On croit aussi que les poèmes de Jean Renart ont été écrits entre 1195 et 1215, ce qui est une erreur, car ces poèmes, par leur style et par leur allure, appartiennent évidemment à une époque postérieure. Dans cet article, je vais m'efforcer de démontrer que l'*Escoufle* a dû être écrit après 1241, et qu'il nous faut donc considérer Jean Renart comme un contemporain de Saint Louis et non de Philippe Auguste.

I

L'auteur de l'*Escoufle*² a dédié son poème à un comte de Hainaut, qu'il ne nomme point:

9058

Ançois c'on le sace par France,
Voudrai je que mes roumans aut
Jusqu'al gentil conte en Hainaut:
Sel metra en autorité.

Paul Meyer a pensé que ce comte de Hainaut devait être Baudouin V (1171-95), ou son fils Baudouin VI (1195-1205), et il a donné la pré-

¹ F. M. Warren, *Modern Language Notes*, XXIII, 68-73 et 96-100; Joseph Bédier, *Le Lai de l'ombre* ("Société des anciens textes français" [Paris, 1913]); Ch.-V. Langlois, *La Vie en France au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1924), I, 36-71 et 341-57.

² Paul Meyer, *L'Escoufle* ("Société des anciens textes français" [Paris, 1894]).

férence à ce dernier.³ Depuis, on a admis que *l'Escoufle* a été écrit entre 1195 et 1202, date du départ de Baudouin VI pour l'Orient où il devait devenir empereur de Constantinople, en 1204. Seul Gröber a supposé depuis qu'il pouvait s'agir d'un des successeurs de Baudouin VI, et il a suggéré que le comte en question pouvait être un des deux maris de Marguerite de Flandre, fille cadette de Baudouin VI, soit Bouchard d'Avesnes, soit Guillaume de Dampierre.⁴ Mais Marguerite de Flandre n'est devenue comtesse de Flandre et de Hainaut qu'en 1244, à la mort de sa sœur aînée. A ce moment, ses deux maris étaient morts, et les deux comtés ont été divisés entre les deux familles, les Avesnes obtenant le Hainaut, et les Dampierre la Flandre.⁵ Quant à Jeanne, fille aînée de Baudouin VI et son successeur dans les deux comtés (1205-44), elle s'est mariée deux fois, et ses deux maris, Ferrand de Portugal (1212-33) et Thomas de Savoie (1237-44), ont porté tous les deux le titre de comte de Flandre et de Hainaut. Les comtes de Hainaut, de 1171 à 1300, ont donc été:

BAUDOUIN V, 1171-95, comte de Flandre à partir de 1191

BAUDOUIN VI, comte de Flandre et de Hainaut, 1195-1202

FERRAND DE PORTUGAL, comte de Flandre et de Hainaut de 1212 à 1233, prisonnier à Paris de 1214 à 1226

THOMAS DE SAVOIE, comte de Flandre et de Hainaut, 1237-44

JEAN I D'AVESNES, comte de Hainaut, 1244-56

JEAN II D'AVESNES, comte de Hainaut, 1256-1304

Rien ne nous permet d'affirmer que ce soit Baudouin VI plutôt qu'un autre, que le poète a voulu désigner.

Il est aussi question dans le poème d'une comtesse de Champagne qui n'est pas nommée non plus:

5614

Se la contesse de Champaigne

I venist, ne sai je a quel oés

On en fesist tel feste lués.

Rien ne prouve que cette comtesse soit Marie de France, veuve d'Henri le Libéral, morte en 1198, comme on l'a supposé gratuitement. Elle pourrait tout aussi bien être Blanche de Navarre, mère de Thibaut le Chansonnier, ou Marguerite de Bourbon, femme de ce dernier.⁶

³ *Ibid.*, pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

⁴ Gustav Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, II, Abt. I, 530.

⁵ Duvivier, *La Querelle des Avesnes et des Dampierre* (Bruxelles-Paris, 1894), Vol. I.

⁶ D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, IV, Partie I.

Le Roman de l'Escoufle est, on le sait, divisé en deux parties. La première (vss. 1-1766) a pour héros Richard de Montivilliers; la seconde, de beaucoup la plus longue, raconte les aventures du fils de Richard, Guillaume. Cette seconde partie est évidemment une œuvre d'imagination et n'a rien d'historique. Mais la première partie contient de nombreuses allusions à des événements historiques qui peuvent nous aider à dater le poème.

Il y est d'abord question d'un empereur qui domine sur l'Italie méridionale. Cet empereur n'appartient pas à la tradition byzantine, comme c'est le cas dans beaucoup d'autres romans, notamment dans *Eracle*, de Gautier d'Arras. Ici au contraire, il s'agit d'un empereur du Saint-Empire:

2792 Or sera sire uns avolés
Des Alemans et des Rommains.

De plus, les vers suivants, qui mentionnent les ennemis de l'empereur, font évidemment allusion à la Ligue lombarde:

7480 Que mout l'ont cremu et douté
Li Genevois et li Pisan.

Il s'agit donc d'un empereur d'Allemagne qui est aussi roi de Sicile,⁷ et qui vit habituellement en Italie.⁸ Or trois empereurs d'Allemagne ont porté la couronne de Sicile: Henri VI (1194-97), Frédéric II (1197-1250), et Conrad IV (1250-54); mais un seul, Frédéric II, a passé la plus grande partie de sa vie en Italie, où il est né et où il est mort. C'est bien lui dont il est question dans le poème, comme va le montrer ce qui suit.

Quand Richard de Montivilliers revient de la croisade et qu'il rencontre l'empereur à Bénévent, celui-ci lui fait part de ses déboires. Il lui raconte:

1484 Comme il vint primes a l'empire,
Comme il mist ses sers de desus,
Comme il ot maté et confus
Contes, haus barons et chasés.
Fait il: "Or est si revelés
Li grans orguels de ma servaille
Que je n'iere tex que je aille

⁷ Il est parfois appelé roi dans le poème (vss. 4184 et 4195).

⁸ Il y demeure au moins quinze ans.

De vile a autre sans conduit.
 Il ont mes forès, mon deduit,
 Mes chastiax, mes riches cités;
 Et cil que j'ai por eus matés
 M'ont laissié tot si a .j. fais
 Que honis soit princes qui laist
 Por ses vilains ses gentix homes. ..."

Le pauvre empereur, après avoir eu de grandes difficultés avec sa noblesse, en a eu ensuite avec sa *servaille* qu'il avait trop favorisée. Or c'est précisément ce qui est arrivé à Frédéric: après avoir réprimé plusieurs révoltes de ses barons, il a dû lutter, non seulement contre la Ligue lombarde, mais aussi contre les villes du Royaume de Sicile.

Lorsqu'il devint majeur en 1209, et prit en mains les rênes du gouvernement, une révolte générale des barons éclata; et *li rois demora à Messine avec ses borgeis, que des chevaliers n'avoit il gaires avec lui*.⁹ La répression fut terrible. Mais pendant son séjour en Allemagne, une nouvelle révolte avait éclaté, celle des barons d'Apulie dont le chef était le comte de Molise. A son retour, aux assises de Capoue (15 déc. 1220),¹⁰ il interdit aux barons et aux prélats d'exercer la fonction de *justicier*.¹¹ En 1222, il ordonne la destruction d'un grand nombre de châteaux. La même année, se trouvant en Sicile où il faisait campagne contre les Sarrasins, il appelle à son service un certain nombre de barons, et dès qu'ils sont arrivés, il les fait arrêter et fait confisquer leurs terres.¹² Au même moment, nous le voyons s'entourer de gens de basse extraction auxquels il confie des postes importants, tel le célèbre Pierre des Vignes qui devient chancelier, et qui, accusé plus tard de trahison et aveuglé par ordre de Frédéric, se tuera de désespoir. En 1221, l'empereur anoblit Frédéric d'Arco, ses deux neveux et leurs héritiers légitimes.¹³

Mais la situation change bientôt. Les villes du Royaume de Sicile étaient jusqu'ici restées fidèles à Frédéric, parce qu'il était le protégé du pape. Cependant, à partir de 1225, les relations avec la Papauté

⁹ *Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr*, "Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens occidentaux," II, 299.

¹⁰ Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Frederici II* (Paris, 1852), II, 91.

¹¹ Les *justiciers* étaient les gouverneurs des provinces.

¹² *Chronicon Richardi de S. Germano*, éd. Muratori, VII, 996.

¹³ Huillard-Bréholles, *op. cit.* II, 144.

se gâtent. Les villes lombardes ont reformé leur ligue, et Peire de la Caravana les incite à résister pour éviter le sort des barons d'Apulie:

De Pulla'us sovegna
Dels valens baros
Qu'il non an que pregna
For de lor maisos;
Gardaz non devegna
Autretal de vos!
Lombart, be'us gardaz.¹⁴ ...

Puis, après le départ de Frédéric pour la Palestine, le pape encourage les villes du Royaume de Sicile à se révolter contre l'empereur excommunié. L'Apulie s'insurge presque toute entière, et la révolte s'étend jusque dans l'île de Sicile. Fogia, Troja, San Severo, Casale Nuovo, Civitate, Larino ferment leurs portes à l'empereur après avoir chassé ses officiers. Le justicier Paul le Logothète est même massacré par les rebelles.¹⁵ Frédéric, à son retour, reprend vite le dessus; mais des résistances acharnées continuent, comme celle de Gaëte.

Cette ville, gouvernée par des consuls et percevant elle-même les revenus de son port, avait joui d'une liberté presque absolue pendant les premiers temps du règne de Frédéric. Dans l'insurrection de 1228, elle s'était déclarée une des premières pour le pape et elle se soumit la dernière. Frédéric II, après de longues négociations, accorda une amnistie complète aux habitants, mais il leur retira le consulat et établit dans leur port une douane royale.¹⁶

Pour punir les villes, Frédéric restreint les libertés municipales. Il abolit les *stratigots*, magistrats municipaux qui dans certaines villes importantes avaient le droit de juger au criminel.¹⁷ Ces mesures provoquent une nouvelle révolte en 1232. Messine s'insurge pour défendre ses privilèges; Catane, Nicosie, Centorbi, Syracuse font de même. Le justicier Richard de Montenegro est chassé de la province parce qu'il agissait au détriment des libertés municipales.¹⁸ Au mois de janvier 1233, l'empereur fait raser les fortifications de Troja. En septembre 1234, il ordonne la destruction de plusieurs villages d'Apulie et se fait remettre des otages. En mars 1235, ces captifs sont condamnés à diverses peines ou mis en liberté moyennant une rançon

¹⁴ *Poesie Provenzali storiche relative all'Italia*, ed. Vincenzo de Bartholomaeis ("Istituto Storico Italiano [Roma, 1931]," Vol. LXXI), I, 36.

¹⁵ Huillard-Bréholles, *Introduction à l'histoire diplomatique de l'empereur Frédéric II* (Paris, 1859), p. cccxcviii.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. edviii, n. 2.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. edviii.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. cd.

payée par leurs compatriotes.¹⁹ Une répression impitoyable fait tout rentrer dans l'ordre. A partir de ce moment, les villes du Royaume de Sicile restent fidèles à l'empereur; mais, plus au nord, la lutte contre la Ligue lombarde, avec des alternatives de succès et de revers, se prolonge jusqu'à la mort de Frédéric, en 1250.

Lorsque l'empereur se plaint de ses sujets, il insiste sur le point suivant:

1488

... Or est si revelés
Li grand orguels de ma servaille
Que je n'iere tex que je aille
De vile a autre sans conduit.

Il ne peut voyager librement dans l'empire, il ne peut se rendre de ville en ville qu'avec une escorte de soldats. Or nous savons qu'une des plus grandes difficultés qu'éprouvait Frédéric II était de ne pouvoir se déplacer librement. La Ligue lombarde, redoutant de voir réunies contre elle les forces de l'Empire et celles du Royaume de Sicile, faisait tout son possible pour couper les lignes de communications avec l'Allemagne, pour empêcher l'empereur de séjourner longtemps en Lombardie et d'y concentrer des troupes, pour essayer même de s'emparer de lui.

En juillet 1212, se rendant en Allemagne pour y recueillir l'héritage des Hohenstaufen, Frédéric traversait la Lombardie. La grande majorité des villes lombardes lui était hostile. Pise, Crémone, et Pavie étaient parmi les rares villes qui lui étaient fidèles. Lorsqu'ils apprirent que le roi approchait, les Milanais descendirent vers le sud pour le surprendre, les Placentins arrêtèrent tous les bateaux qui descendaient le Pô. Frédéric avait avec lui une escorte de Pavésans qui devaient l'accompagner jusqu'au Lambro, où les Crémonais l'attendaient pour l'escorter jusqu'à Crémone. La jonction des deux groupes s'était opérée et tout le monde se reposait, quand les Milanais apparurent soudainement et essayèrent de s'emparer de Frédéric. Celui-ci eut juste le temps de sauter à cheval. Il réussit à franchir la rivière à la nage et put ainsi atteindre Crémone. Il passa ensuite les Alpes par l'Engadine.²⁰

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. cd-cdl.

²⁰ Ernst Kantorowicz, *Frederic the Second*, trad. E. O. Lorimer ("Makers of the Middle Ages" [New York, 1931]), p. 57.

En 1226, Frédéric avait convoqué à Crémone les délégués des villes lombardes, et son fils Henri, roi de Germanie, devait l'y rejoindre et lui amener un contingent d'Allemands. Comme l'empereur se rendait en Lombardie et passait par la Romagne, les habitants de Faenza cherchèrent à le tuer.²¹ Les villes lombardes se saisirent de la Cluse de Vérone par où devait passer le jeune Henri qui se trouvait à Trente; et, "avant de lui permettre de franchir les Alpes, elles exigèrent de Frédéric II qu'il s'interdit le droit de les mettre au ban de l'Empire tant qu'il serait dans la Lombardie, la Marche ou la Romagne; que son fils et les princes allemands ne vinssent pas à la diète avec plus de 1200 chevaux; que l'empereur, avant l'arrivée de son fils, renvoyât toutes les troupes qu'il pouvait avoir avec lui, et qu'il ne fit venir aucun approvisionnement pour lui et pour les siens pendant la tenue de l'assemblée."²² Les négociations engagées n'ayant donné aucun résultat, Frédéric fit excommunier les villes lombardes et les fit mettre au ban de l'Empire. Mais la Ligue tint bon; Henri ne put franchir les Alpes, et Frédéric lui-même fut obligé de quitter la Lombardie. Comme il redescendait vers le sud et traversait les monts de Monbardon, redoutant l'hostilité des Toscans, il s'arrêta à Pontremoli, où il attendit l'arrivée de la milice pisane qui l'escorta jusqu'à Pise.²³

En 1228, la Ligue empêche complètement une autre assemblée convoquée par l'empereur à Ravenne pour le carême, arrêtant les Allemands au passage et les dépouillant de leur argent, même ceux qui avaient revêtu les insignes de la croisade.²⁴ En 1232, le pape Grégoire IX ayant annoncé aux Lombards que Frédéric se rendait en Lombardie, et les ayant invités à faire la paix, ceux-ci lui demandent: *ut sic ageret ne imperator ad Lombardie partes possit nec debeat cum exercitu accedere*. L'empereur convoque une nouvelle assemblée à Ravenne; mais, devant l'hostilité de la Ligue, cette assemblée n'a pas lieu non plus. Frédéric quitte Ravenne secrètement *cum parva turba militum*, et arrive à la limite du territoire vénitien. Là il annonce son intention de visiter l'église Saint-Marc et demande à Venise de le recevoir lui et les siens. En réalité, il voulait traverser le territoire de la République pour se rendre à Aquilée, où il devait retrouver les

²¹ Huillard-Bréholles, *Introduction* ... , p. cdxlii.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. cdxlvii-cdxlviii.

²³ "Annales Placentini Ghibellini," *MGH*, XVIII, 469.

²⁴ Huillard-Bréholles, *Introduction* ..., p. cdl.

Allemands. Venise lui accorde la permission d'entrer dans la cité et d'y rester quatre ou cinq jours.²⁵

Enfin, nous avons le témoignage de Frédéric lui-même. Un contemporain nous a rapporté que l'empereur, au moment de franchir le Mincio, en 1238, s'est écrié en présence de ses barons: "Quum peregrini et viatores ambulans ubique, ego autem non sum ausus aggredi per terras imperii."²⁶

Dans le poème, lorsque Richard de Montivilliers a reçu les confidences de l'empereur, il décide de l'aider dans sa lutte contre ses serfs. Richard revenait alors de la croisade. Or nous savons que Frédéric fut également aidé par les Croisés, qui revenaient avec lui de Palestine en 1230, et que c'est grâce à eux qu'il put soumettre les villes de la Terre de Labour.²⁷ Dans l'*Escoufle*, Richard de Montivilliers fait appel à la noblesse de France pour venir en aide à l'empereur:

1562

Outre les mons envoie en France
Li quens les bons chevaliers querre;
Ne veut pas maintenir la guerre
Par les vilains ne par communes.

Frédéric a également recruté des troupes en France, notamment en 1238, lorsqu'il allait commencer ses opérations contre Milan:

Ensi l'emperere remest
Par le pais, ça et la mest,
Manda princes et cevaliers,
Manda siergans et saudoiers;
Li quens de Gisnes fu mandés,
Petit apriés s'en est alés.
Mais il enquist au roi de France
Ançois et congiét et soufrance:
Et li rois congiét l'en donna.²⁸

Philippe Mouskés, un contemporain, et l'auteur du passage précédent, nous a laissé dans sa chronique un récit des exploits accomplis par le comte de Guisnes et l'évêque de Valence au siège de Milan. Le roi d'Angleterre envoya aussi à Frédéric, son beau-frère, un détachement

²⁵ Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica* ..., IV, Part II, 937-39.

²⁶ *Chronicon de rebus in Italia gestis*, dans Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica* ..., IV, 948.

²⁷ *Chronicon Richardi de S. Germano*, éd. Muratori, VII, 1013.

²⁸ Philippe Mouskés, *Chronique rimée* (Bruxelles, 1838), II, 644.

sous le commandement d'Henri de Trumbleville qui se distingua aux sièges de Milan et de Brescia.²⁹

Un autre point important, c'est que, dans l'*Escoufle*, la rencontre de l'empereur et de Richard de Montivilliers a lieu à Bénévent:

1369

... S'en sont venu à Bonivent.

L'empereres novelement

I ert venus por sejourner.

Or cette ville ne faisait pas partie du Royaume de Sicile; elle appartenait aux papes depuis le milieu du XI^{ème} siècle. Lorsque Innocent II avait été vaincu par les Normands en 1135, il avait dû leur reconnaître la possession du duché de Bénévent, mais il avait gardé pour lui la ville et ses environs immédiats. Sans doute l'empereur avait-il des droits assez vagues sur Bénévent, comme sur tous les Etats de l'Eglise. L'auteur de *Guillaume de Palerne*, poème contemporain de l'*Escoufle* et qui se trouve dans le même manuscrit, nous explique fort bien la chose dans un passage où il s'agit également de Bénévent:

Si estoit l'apostoile lige,

Fors que la souveraine justice

En estoit à l'empereor.³⁰

Mais en dépit de ce droit de justice souveraine, l'empereur ne pouvait pénétrer librement dans Bénévent qu'avec la permission du pape ou la complicité des habitants. Or le pape n'était pas disposé à laisser entrer l'empereur dans une des principales forteresses de ses états; quant aux habitants, ils étaient violemment hostiles à Frédéric II. En 1229, pendant qu'il était en Palestine, les Bénéventains avaient pillé l'Apulie et vaincu les troupes impériales.³¹ Complètement enclavée dans le Royaume de Sicile, Bénévent était devenue, après la répression de la révolte des villes, le refuge de tous les ennemis de l'empereur.³² Aussi lorsque la guerre recommence officiellement contre le pape, Frédéric ordonne-t-il de bloquer Bénévent, d'en dévaster les environs, et d'empêcher le retour des transfuges dans le Royaume.³³

²⁹ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora* (London, 1877), III, 485-86.

³⁰ *Guillaume de Palerne*, éd. Michelant ("Société des anciens textes français" [Paris, 1876]), vss. 3889-91.

³¹ *Chronicon Richardi de S. Germano*, éd. Muratori, VII, 1010.

³² Fr. J. Biehringer, *Kaiser Friedrich II* (Berlin, 1912), p. 169.

³³ *Chronicon Richardi de S. Germano*, éd. Muratori, VII, 1045.

Au mois d'août 1240, un siège en règle est commencé, et, en avril 1241, les troupes impériales pénètrent dans la ville. Par ordre de Frédéric les murailles et les tours sont détruites.³⁴ L'empereur n'avait pas assisté à la prise de la ville, car il assiégeait alors Faenza, dont il voulait punir les habitants d'avoir cherché à le tuer quinze ans auparavant. Mais cinq mois plus tard, en septembre 1241, comme il traversait la Campanie, il passa à Bénévent d'où il ordonna que les trésors des églises fussent envoyés à Foggia, sa capitale, où il se rendait.³⁵ Comme il était arrivé à Foggia en octobre, son séjour à Bénévent n'a pu durer plus d'un mois.

Ces détails nous sont rapportés par Richard de San Germano, notaire royal à la cour de Sicile, qui a noté avec le plus grand soin dans sa chronique les déplacements de l'empereur. C'est la seule mention que nous ayons d'un passage de Frédéric à Bénévent au cours de ses cinquante trois ans de règne. Or, de même que dans l'*Escoufle* le séjour de l'empereur à Bénévent coïncide avec le retour de Palestine et l'arrivée en Italie de Richard de Montivilliers; de même, dans l'histoire, le passage de Frédéric dans cette même ville coïncide avec l'arrivée en Italie de Richard de Cornouailles et des Croisés de 1239.

II

L'empereur dont il est question dans l'*Escoufle* est donc bien Frédéric II. Comment l'auteur était-il si bien renseigné sur les événements d'Italie?

Nous savons qu'un des protecteurs de Jean Renart était Miles (ou Milon) de Nanteuil, à qui il a dédié *Guillaume de Dôle*,³⁶ et qui fut évêque de Beauvais de 1217 à 1234. Or Miles de Nanteuil a été cinq fois en Italie. D'abord, en 1218, alors qu'il était seulement élu de Beauvais, et se rendait en Egypte; puis, à son retour, il débarque à Bari et est sacré évêque par le pape à son passage à Rome en 1222.³⁷ En 1226, il est envoyé en ambassade par Louis VIII auprès du roi de Germanie, le jeune Henri, et se trouve à Trente avec ce dernier lorsque la Ligue lombarde saisit la cluse de Vérone. Miles et les autres ambassadeurs français réussissent à franchir les Alpes et rejoignent Fré-

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1046.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1048.

³⁶ *Guillaume de Dôle*, éd. Servois ("Société des anciens textes français" [Paris, 1893]), vss. 5-6. Voir aussi l'introduction.

³⁷ *Récits d'un Ménestrel de Reims*, éd. Wailly, pp. 79-93.

déric à Borgo San Domino.³⁸ Miles revient ensuite en France et retrouve Louis VIII dans le Midi. Il est de nouveau en Italie de 1229 à 1231, où Grégoire IX l'a appelé pour lutter contre le parti impérial. Il reçoit du pape l'investiture du duché de Spolète et de la Marche d'Ancône; mais, n'ayant pu réussir à s'y maintenir, il revient en France en 1231.³⁹ Il repart pour l'Italie en 1234, afin de demander au pape d'intervenir en sa faveur auprès du roi de France, mais il meurt en se rendant à Rome.⁴⁰

En sa qualité de conseiller du roi, Miles avait aussi très probablement participé aux négociations qui eurent lieu entre Toul et Vaucouleurs en 1224, pour empêcher le mariage du jeune Henri avec la sœur du roi d'Angleterre; et, en 1226, au cours de son séjour dans le Midi, il a dû passer par Saint-Gilles. Or, il est longuement question de Toul et de Saint-Gilles dans l'*Escoufle*. Ne pourrait-on supposer que la coïncidence entre le retour en Italie des Croisés de 1239 et de 1240, et le passage de Frédéric à Bénévent, n'est qu'un effet du hasard? Il n'est pas prouvé que la rencontre de Frédéric et des Croisés se soit faite à Bénévent même. Cette ville avait une certaine célébrité et est mentionnée dans d'autres romans, notamment dans *Guillaume de Palerne*. L'*Escoufle* aurait pu être composé après le retour de Miles en France en 1231. A ce moment, Frédéric avait dompté ses barons; il avait déjà eu plusieurs querelles avec la Ligue lombarde. En 1226, son fils Henri n'avait pu le rejoindre en Italie; lui-même avait été considérablement gêné par la Ligue dans ses déplacements; et Miles de Nanteuil s'était trouvé mêlé aux événements de 1226. En 1230, à son retour de la croisade, l'empereur avait trouvé les villes d'Apulie et de la Terre de Labour révoltées contre lui, et il les avait soumises avec l'aide des Croisés. Nous avons déjà vu qu'il est fait allusion à tous ces événements dans le poème.⁴¹ Il est aussi dit dans l'*Escoufle* que Jérusalem se trouvait alors aux mains des Chrétiens (vss. 455-574); or Jérusalem était redevenue chrétienne en 1229.⁴² Il est possible que Jean Renart ait pu être informé de tout cela par Miles de Nanteuil, et qu'il ait également obtenu de lui certains détails pittoresques

³⁸ Huillard-Bréholles, *Introduction à l'histoire diplomatique de Frédéric II*, pp. ccxcli-ccxcvi; Petit-Dutaillis, *Etude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII*, pp. 264-66.

³⁹ Richardi de Sancto Germano *Chronicon*, éd. Muratori, VII, 1027; Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, I, 8615, 8617, 8644, et 8677.

⁴⁰ *Gallia Christiana*, IX, 743.

⁴¹ Voir la première partie de cet article.

⁴² Jérusalem a été aux mains des Chrétiens de 1099 à 1187, et de 1229 à 1244.

sur le passage de Montjoux (vss. 363-64),⁴³ et sur l'embarquement des vivres à Brindisi (vss. 385-96). Donc l'*Escoufle* aurait été composé peu après 1231.

Il y a cependant plusieurs objections. Comment Jean Renart, si bien informé par Miles, aurait-il pu imaginer un séjour de l'empereur à Bénévent, précisément à l'époque où l'hostilité des Bénéventains à l'égard de Frédéric était à son comble? Aussi, l'auteur de l'*Escoufle* est très favorable à l'empereur, et par contre violemment hostile aux vilains, aux communes et à la *servaille*; or, Miles de Nanteuil, de 1229 à 1231, a combattu pour le pape et pour les communes, contre l'empereur. De plus, c'est plus tard seulement que Frédéric a recruté des troupes à l'étranger, en 1234 en Angleterre, lorsque son mariage avec la sœur d'Henri III eut été décidé; en 1237 en France, avant de commencer ses opérations contre Milan.

Enfin, il est à peu près certain que Jean Renart a connu certains détails de l'expédition de Richard de Cornouailles en Terre Sainte, en 1240-41, et qu'il les a utilisés en écrivant l'*Escoufle*. En effet, si nous comparons la croisade de Richard de Montivilliers à celle du comte de Cornouailles, telle que nous la trouvons décrite dans Matthieu Paris,⁴⁴ nous trouvons beaucoup de traits communs. J'admets que plusieurs d'entre eux peuvent être un simple effet du hasard, par exemple le fait que nos deux Richard sont tous deux de grands seigneurs fort riches et fort généreux,⁴⁵ car c'était la coutume pour les poètes du XIII^e siècle de célébrer la largesse de leurs protecteurs et de leurs héros. La présence en Palestine du sénéchal de Richard de Montivilliers (vs. 684), et du sénéchal de R. de Cornouailles, lequel mourut à la croisade,⁴⁶ n'est peut-être aussi qu'une simple coïncidence. Mais il y a d'autres traits communs qu'on ne saurait attribuer uniquement au hasard. En voici quelques uns.

Quand Richard de Montivilliers approche de Jérusalem, le roi chrétien de la ville vient à sa rencontre,⁴⁷ et une réception magnifique

⁴³ Aujourd'hui le Grand Saint-Bernard.

⁴⁴ Matthieu Paris connaissait personnellement Richard de Cornouailles. Voir *Chronica majora*, I, préf., viii.

⁴⁵ Richard de Cornouailles, qui tirait des revenus énormes des mines de plomb et d'étain de son comté de Cornouailles, passait pour être l'homme le plus riche de son temps.

⁴⁶ "*Johannes filius Johannis, comitis Ricardi senescallus* . . ."; Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, IV, 175.

⁴⁷ Il n'y avait pas de roi à Jérusalem en 1240, mais seulement un *baile* qui représentait l'empereur Frédéric, ce dernier étant devenu roi de Jérusalem par suite de son mariage avec Isabelle de Brienne, fille du roi Jean.

l'attend en ville. Les rues sont jonchées d'herbe; les façades des maisons sont tendues de riches étoffes; et il y a beaucoup de belles dames aux fenêtres:

550 Ainc puis le tans Pieron l'ermite
 Ne vint mais chevaliers de France
 Cui on fesist tele honorance
 En la cité de Jersalem.

D'autre part, quand R. de Cornouailles débarque à Acre (11 octobre 1240), tout le peuple accourt pour le recevoir: les prêtres ornés de leurs vêtements sacrés, les barons qui s'empressent autour de lui, et la foule, les mains tendues vers le ciel, qui l'accueille en chantant: "Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini."⁴⁸

Le lendemain de sa réception à Jérusalem, Richard de Montivilliers donne un grand banquet où il fait inviter tous les pèlerins qui se trouvent sans seigneur, et partant sans ressources:

686 ... Et font corner a .ij. buisines
 Le laver, si com faire soelent,
 A trestous ceus qui manger voelent,
 Qui sans signor sont en la terre. ...

Naturellement, ces pauvres gens s'empressent d'accourir:

696 En la vile n'ot escuier,
 Chevalier, garçon ne serjant
 N'i alast mangier tot errant.

Le banquet est magnifique. Il y a de la musique et des chants; le comte fait de riches cadeaux à ses invités. A la fin du banquet, ceux-ci offrent au comte leurs services qui sont tout de suite acceptés (732-55). Or, R. de Cornouailles, trois jours après son arrivée à Acre, fait annoncer qu'il prendra à son service tous les pèlerins qui se trouvent sans ressources.⁴⁹

Avant de partir pour Jérusalem, le lendemain de son débarquement, Richard de Montivilliers fait venir tous les maquignons d'Acre à son hôtel, achète un grand nombre de chevaux, et en donne à tous ceux de ses gens qui n'en ont pas:

446 Li quens a tos ciaux qui n'en orent
 Mout sagement les departist.

Nous ignorons si R. de Cornouailles en a fait autant, mais nous savons qu'une des causes du désastre de Gaza, en 1239, où beaucoup de

⁴⁸ Matthew Paris, *op. cit.*, IV, 71.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

Croisés avaient été tués ou faits prisonniers, avait été précisément le manque de chevaux: "... Maiz mainz i avoit de chevaux que mestierz ne fu a si grant ost. Il i avoit de vaillanz chevalierz a grant planté et de bonz sergenz qui aloient a pié. Et moult durement leur grevoit la voie car il n'avoient mie ce apriz. ..." ⁵⁰

R. de Montivilliers accomplit de grands exploits en Palestine. Il est fait *mestre de l'ost* (vss. 1053-55); il surprend le camp de l'ennemi et fait un butin considérable (vss. 869-1000). Plus tard, après un combat singulier avec un des chefs turcs, il détruit l'armée des Infidèles et fait prisonnier le roi de Mossoul (vss. 1001-1310). Il signe ensuite une trêve qui augmente considérablement le territoire du royaume de Jérusalem:

1316

... K'il lor fist doner bone triue
A .iij. ans; ne n'en doutés mie
K'il plus de journée et demie
Ne gaaignast la marce en la,
Qu'ele ert quant il i vint de la.

R. de Cornouailles n'a pas accompli de pareils exploits. Nous ignorons même s'il a livré un seul combat, car il semble avoir passé tout son temps en négociations. Cependant, il a, lui aussi, joué un rôle de premier plan, et il a signé une trêve très avantageuse. A son arrivée en Terre Sainte, la situation semblait désespérée. La croisade de 1239 s'était terminée par le désastre de Gaza (13 nov. 1239), où ceux des chefs francs qui ne s'étaient pas enfuis au début de la bataille avaient été tués ou capturés par les Musulmans d'Egypte.⁵¹ Thibaut de Navarre et Pierre Mauclerc étaient bien restés en Palestine jusqu'en septembre 1240, mais ils n'avaient rien accompli. Richard entama des pourparlers avec le sultan d'Egypte, qui était le suzerain de tous les états musulmans de Syrie, et qui détenait les prisonniers de Gaza. Grâce à une énorme rançon que sa fortune personnelle lui permettait de payer, Richard put délivrer ces malheureux, et conclut avec le sultan une trêve qui rendait aux Chrétiens toute la Palestine jusqu'au Jourdain.⁵² Les résultats qu'il avait obtenus, la trêve signée avec le sultan, et surtout la libération des prisonniers, lui acquirent une renommée considérable en Occident. En effet, ceux qu'il avait délivrés

⁵⁰ *Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr*, "Recueil des historiens des Croisades, historiens occidentaux," II, 532.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, II, 546; Matthew Paris, IV, 25.

⁵² Paris, *op. cit.*, IV, 138-44.

lui en gardèrent reconnaissance toute leur vie, et, de retour en France, chantèrent ses louanges sur tous les tons.⁵³ Il n'est pas douteux que la réputation du comte de Cornouailles, comme celle de R. de Montivilliers, soit sortie grandie de son expédition en Terre Sainte.

Les deux Richard sont d'ailleurs restés peu de temps en Palestine. Le héros du roman

1321 Mout i fist bien en poi de tens.

Il débarque à Brindisi, d'où il avait fait voile à l'aller, et trouve l'empereur à Bénévent (vss. 1369-71). R. de Cornouailles était arrivé à Acre le 11 octobre 1240. Il repart le 3 mai 1241; mais, retardé par des vents contraires, il débarque à Trapani, en Sicile, à la fin de juin ou au début de juillet. Là, il trouve le sénéchal de l'empereur qui l'escorte à travers les villes de Sicile et de Calabre.⁵⁴ Bien que le comte de Cornouailles ait probablement passé par Bénévent, il ne paraît pas y avoir rencontré Frédéric. Ce dernier se trouvait en effet à Interamna, dans la Terre de Labour, au commencement de juillet,⁵⁵ et c'est là que la rencontre a certainement eu lieu.

R. de Montivilliers est fort bien reçu par l'empereur. Ce dernier ne veut pas qu'il ait d'autre hôtel que le sien, et il fait décorer son palais en son honneur (vss. 1376-1411). Même réception triomphale à l'arrivée de R. de Cornouailles. On lui fait prendre des bains et des médicaments pour le remettre des fatigues du voyage; on le distrait en faisant danser devant lui des danseuses arabes.⁵⁶ L'auteur du roman nous dit que l'empereur n'aurait pas mieux reçu le comte de Montivilliers si celui-ci avait été son fils ou son frère:

1414 S'il fust ou ses fix ou ses frere,
Se li fist on assés d'ounor.

Matthieu Paris, en parlant de R. de Cornouailles, emploie des termes analogues: "... deinde cum imperatore, quasi filius cum patre ..."; et ailleurs: "Erat imperator amicissimus, et quasi alter imperator. ..."⁵⁷ Les deux Richard sont également bien accueillis de l'impératrice.⁵⁸

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

⁵⁵ Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Frederici II*, V, 1272.

⁵⁶ Paris, *op. cit.*, IV, 146-47.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 148, 166.

⁵⁸ *L'Escoufle*, vs. 1416; Paris, *op. cit.*, IV, 147.

Ici se place un épisode que nous avons déjà cité dans la première partie de cet article: R. de Montivilliers reçoit les confidences de l'empereur et décide de l'aider à soumettre ses sujets révoltés (vs. 14). Il ne paraît pas que le comte de Cornouailles ait combattu pour Frédéric. Ce dernier n'en avait nullement besoin, car, au début de 1241, il avait triomphé de tous ses ennemis. Le pape même semblait prêt à négocier. Frédéric envoya son beau-frère en ambassade à Rome, après lui avoir donné carte blanche, tant il avait confiance en sa prudence et en sa loyauté. Mais, entre temps, Grégoire IX s'était ressaisi et exigeait de nouveau la capitulation complète de Frédéric. Les négociations échouèrent, et R. de Cornouailles revint auprès de l'empereur. Matthieu Paris rapporte avec indignation que Richard fut assez mal reçu par le pape.⁵⁹

Le comte de Cornouailles resta encore quatre mois auprès de son beau-frère. Il l'accompagna lorsque celui-ci se rendit à Bénévent, puis à Fogia, où il dut rester jusqu'à la fin d'octobre. Avant son départ, il fut rejoint par les chevaliers francs qui, grâce à lui, avaient recouvré leur liberté. Comme ils sont repartis avec lui, et qu'ils l'ont rejoint quelque temps auparavant, ils ont dû arriver en Italie au mois de septembre, et il semble bien que c'est à Bénévent qu'ils ont retrouvé l'empereur et son beau-frère. Ils étaient dans le plus complet dénuelement, et Richard fit encore une fois preuve de sa générosité en les équipant à neuf. Le comte de Cornouailles repartit avec eux, reçu magnifiquement partout où il passait.⁶⁰ Il se sépara d'eux après avoir franchi les Alpes, et débarqua à Douvres le 7 janvier 1242.⁶¹

III

Il nous reste à déterminer comment l'auteur de l'*Escoufle* a pu être informé de la croisade du comte de Cornouailles et de la rencontre de Bénévent. Il est certain qu'il n'a pas pris part à l'expédition, car en plusieurs endroits, de peur de commettre des erreurs, il annonce qu'il va passer certains détails:

1306

Por ce que je criem qu'il anuit
Et que j'en mençoigne ne chiee,
N'os je dire en quel chevauchiee
N'en quel ost li Franc s'en alerent.

⁵⁹ Paris, *op. cit.*, IV, 147-48.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 166-67.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 180-81.

1311

Ne voel c'on m'en prengne a mençoigne,
 Mais tant vos di je sans aloigne,
 Mout fist li quens bien en la terre.

D'autre part, il n'a pu obtenir certains renseignements qu'il nous donne, par exemple, sur l'achat des chevaux à Acre (vss. 425-47), que d'un témoin oculaire; et ce témoin est très certainement un des Croisés libérés par Richard de Cornouailles. Ce qui suit va le démontrer.

Paul Meyer avait cru que l'auteur de l'*Escoufle* était originaire du Vexin normand.⁶² Depuis, A. Thomas a prouvé que certaines formes en usage dans la Picardie et le Soissonnais se trouvent dans le poème,⁶³ et Färber, après une étude détaillée du langage de l'auteur, a conclu que ce dernier devait être originaire de l'Oise.⁶⁴ Or, un grand nombre de chevaliers de cette région avaient pris part à la croisade de 1239: Simon de Clermont et son frère Raoul, Richard, vicomte de Beaumont, Jean des Barres, Raoul de Soissons, Philippe de Nanteuil, et Guillaume, bouteiller de Senlis.⁶⁵ Simon de Clermont, Richard de Beaumont et Jean des Barres avaient été tués à la bataille de Gaza; Raoul de Soissons était resté en Palestine après la croisade; les autres étaient revenus en France à la fin de 1241. Nous avons vu qu'ils avaient très probablement rencontré l'empereur à Bénévent en septembre 1241. C'est évidemment d'eux que parle notre poète quand il mentionne un événement analogue, et c'est de l'un d'eux qu'il a obtenu son information, peut-être bien de Philippe de Nanteuil.

A ce sujet, il faut que nous nous occupions de deux tençons sur lesquelles Ch.-V. Langlois a appelé l'attention.⁶⁶ La première de ces tençons⁶⁷ est un dialogue entre un vieux ménestrel, Renart de Dammartin en Goële, et son cheval, également vieux, Vairon. La seconde est aussi un dialogue entre un clerc nommé Piaudoué, et un vieux ménestrel appelé Renart.⁶⁸ Victor Le Clerc, qui a été le premier à

⁶² *L'Escoufle*, introd., p. xxxiii.

⁶³ *Romania*, XLIII (1914), 254.

⁶⁴ *Romanische Forschungen*, XXXIII (1915), 683-793.

⁶⁵ Voir dans Röhrich, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem* (Innsbruck, 1898), p. 839, la liste des principaux croisés de 1239.

⁶⁶ Langlois, *La Vie en France au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1924), I, Appen. I, pp. 342-57.

⁶⁷ *Du Plait Renard de Dammartin contre Vairon son roncín*, publié par Jubinal ("Nouveau Recueil de contes du Moyen Age" [Paris, 1842]), II, 23.

⁶⁸ *Renart et Piaidoué*, publié par Chabaille dans son édition du *Roman de Renart* (Paris, 1835), pp. 39-54.

étudier ces deux tensons, n'a pas cru qu'elles fussent apparentées, "malgré leur même origine picarde."⁶⁹ Langlois croyait au contraire que les deux Renart ne faisaient qu'un.

Dans la première de ces tensons, dans le *Plait de Renart de Dam-martin contre Vairon son roncín*, les protecteurs du ménestrel sont nommés:

Vous done dont li rois?—Oïl, biaux dons et buens.
L'evesque de Biauvais et de Saint Pol li quens,
Li sires de Nanteuil, qui est miens et je suens,
Et li sire des Barres, dont li maugrez soit tuens.

Langlois, qui a accepté l'opinion de Paul Meyer sur la date de l'*Escoufle* (1195-1202), a cru que l'évêque de Beauvais mentionné dans la tenson n'est autre que Miles de Nanteuil, à qui Jean Renart a dédié *Guillaume de Dôle*; et par conséquent la tenson a dû être rédigée avant 1234, date de la mort de Miles.⁷⁰

Dans les deux tensons, le ménestrel est présenté comme un vieillard; donc les deux poèmes doivent dater de la même époque. Or, un des personnages de la seconde tenson, le clerc Piaudoue, n'est plus pour nous un inconnu. Il figure en effet dans les comptes de Jean Sarrasin, chambellan de Louis IX, pour l'année 1256.⁷¹ Il apparaît d'abord dans le chapitre des sommes dûes par le Temple à Jean Sarrasin du 10 février au 8 novembre 1256, ainsi qu'il suit:

Pro Piaudoe clerico, pro decima C.s.

Et plus loin, au chapitre des sommes dûes par Jean Sarrasin à Jean de Lissy, du 2 juin au 8 novembre 1256, nous trouvons, parmi les nombreux noms mentionnés:

Pro domino P. de Barris	LX.s.
Pro Piaudoe	C.s.

Ce n'est pas tout. Nous trouvons aussi le nom de Piaudoue dans les registres d'Eudes Rigaud, archevêque de Rouen de 1248 à 1275.⁷² Il figure dans le chapitre consacré à l'archidoyenné du Vexin normand (*Archidiaconatus Vulcasinii Normanni*):

⁶⁹ Victor Le Clerc, *Histoire littéraire*, XXIII, 461.

⁷⁰ *Guillaume de Dôle*, 6d. Servois. Voir l'introduction.

⁷¹ *Tabulae Ceratae Johannis Sarraceni*, "Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France," XXI, 348, 381.

⁷² *Polyptychum Rotomagensis Dioecesis*, *ibid.*, XXIII, 305-6.

DECANATUS DE PORCO MORTUO (ALIAS DE BEAUDEMONT)

Ecclesia Sancti Nicolai de Vernoniel. Capitulum Vernonense patronum. Habet VIXX parrochianos. Valet XXX l.t. (Archiepiscopus Odo Rigaudi recepit Girardum dictum Piau d'oue presbyterum, canonicum Vernonensem, ad praesentationem dicti capituli.)

On voit donc qu'un chanoine de Vernon, Girard, surnommé Piau d'oue, a reçu de l'archevêque Eudes Rigaud l'investiture de la paroisse Saint-Nicolas de Vernonnet, sur la présentation du chapitre de Vernon, patron de ladite paroisse, entre 1248 et 1275.

Vernonnet est un faubourg de Vernon, sur la rive droite de la Seine, non loin de Pont-de-l'Arche, Dangu et Mantes, qui sont mentionnés dans la tenson *Renart et Piaudoue*. Il est donc certain que Girard Piaud'oue et le Piaudoue de la tenson sont le même personnage. De plus, nous avons vu que le nom de Piaudoue vient aussitôt après celui de Pierre des Barres dans les comptes de Jean Sarrasin, pour l'année 1256. Dans les mêmes comptes, on trouve aussi les noms de Philippe de Nanteuil et du comte de Saint-Pol.⁷³ Il semble donc que Piaudoue, qui fréquentait la cour tout comme Renart, et recevait tout comme lui de l'argent du roi, était en relations avec les mêmes familles nobles de la région. Le roi protecteur de Piaudoue était Louis IX, qui résidait fréquemment à Vernon où il avait un château.⁷⁴

Langlois avait donc raison d'affirmer que c'est le même Renart qui figure dans les deux tensons, mais il a fait erreur quant à la date. Vu l'époque à laquelle Piaudoue vivait, il est impossible que l'évêque de Beauvais mentionné dans le *Plait* soit Miles de Nanteuil. La rédaction des deux tensons a dû avoir lieu vers 1260; et les protecteurs du ménestrel étaient donc: Louis IX, l'évêque de Beauvais Guillaume de Grès (1249-67), Pierre des Barres, Gui III de Châtillon, comte de Saint-Pol, et Philippe de Nanteuil. Ce dernier semble avoir été le principal protecteur de Renart, ainsi que l'indique le vers suivant du *Plait*: "Mors estes, se n'estoit de Nantuel le langage. ..."

Est-il possible que le Renart des tensons soit Jean Renart, l'auteur de l'*Escoufle*, de *Guillaume de Dôle*, de *Galeran*, et du *Lai de l'Ombre*? Langlois l'a cru. Il a prétendu que les protecteurs du ménestrel men-

⁷³ *Tabulae Ceratae Johannis Sarraceni, ibid.*, XXI, 348, 382.

⁷⁴ Il a séjourné trois fois à Vernon, et deux fois à Pont-de-l'Arche au cours de l'année 1256. Voir à ce sujet *Tabulae Ceratae* *ibid.*, pp. 286-87.

tionnés dans le *Plait*, se retrouvent tous, excepté un (le roi de France),⁷⁵ dans *Guillaume de Dôle*. Cet argument ne joue plus, maintenant que la date des tençons est fixée aux environs de 1260. Langlois se basait aussi sur ce fait que l'on retrouve les mêmes noms de lieux dans les tençons et dans les romans, et que les deux Renart semblent avoir vécu tous les deux dans le Vexin et dans le Valois. Pierre des Barres, qui figure dans le *Plait*, était seigneur d'Oissery, mentionné dans *Guillaume de Dôle*. Un autre protecteur de Renart, le roi de France, résidait fréquemment à Pont-de-l'Arche, mentionné dans l'*Escoufle*. Piaudoue était chanoine de Vernon, non loin de Pont de l'Arche. Un cousin de Piaudoue, Hardouin, était originaire de Montivilliers, tout comme le héros de l'*Escoufle*.

Le problème serait tout de suite résolu, si Miles de Nanteuil, à qui Jean Renart a dédié *Guillaume de Dôle*, et Philippe de Nanteuil, qui figure dans le *Plait*, appartenaient à la même famille; mais ce n'est justement pas le cas. Philippe était seigneur de Nanteuil-le-Haudouin (arr. de Senlis, dép. de l'Oise), tandis que Miles était frère de Gaucher, seigneur de Nanteuil-la-Fosse (arr. de Reims, dép. de la Marne). Le père de Miles et de Gaucher était Gaucher de Châtillon-sur-Marne,⁷⁶ mort en 1187, et qui avait épousé Helvide, héritière de Nanteuil-la-Fosse. Nous sommes donc en présence de deux familles différentes. Est-il possible que Jean Renart ait eu pour protecteurs des membres de ces deux familles? Nous sommes sûrs de Miles, puisqu'il est mentionné dans *Guillaume de Dôle*, mais pour Philippe nous n'avons que des présomptions. Or, n'est-il pas curieux que, dans ce même *Guillaume de Dôle*, l'auteur cite un grand nombre de localités situées non loin de Nanteuil-le-Haudouin, patrie de Philippe, dont six se trouvent dans un rayon de dix kilomètres (Senlis, Brasseuse, Trumilly, Ognon, Dammartin, Oissery), tandis qu'il n'en nomme qu'une seule (Igny) qui soit près de Nanteuil-la-Fosse? Notre auteur, qui n'a pas l'air d'être bien au courant de la topographie de la Champagne, ne semble être devenu le protégé de Miles qu'après l'élection de ce dernier au siège de Beauvais, en 1217, date à laquelle il est venu résider dans la région où demeurerait notre poète. Après la mort de Miles en 1234, il est très possible que Jean Renart soit passé sous la protection de

⁷⁵ Il n'y a pas non plus de sire de Nanteuil mentionné dans *Guillaume de Dôle*.

⁷⁶ *Gallia Christiana*, IX, 740.

Philippe qui habitait également le Valois et qui était un poète renommé. Un des frères de Philippe, Thibaut, était chantre et chanoine de Beauvais lorsque Miles en était évêque. C'est peut-être par l'intermédiaire de Thibaut que Jean Renart a passé dans la famille de Nanteuil-le-Haudouin; et il est possible que ce soit à Philippe et à Thibaut qu'il est fait allusion dans ce vers du *Plait*: "Mors estes, se n'estoit de Nantuel le lignage. ..." Philippe de Nanteuil était un ami personnel de Thibaut de Navarre, qui l'a souvent nommé dans ses poésies, et qu'il a accompagné à la croisade de 1239.⁷⁷ Fait prisonnier à la bataille de Gaza, il avait, pendant sa captivité, composé une chanson où il se plaignait de son infortune.⁷⁸ Il avait été libéré, avec beaucoup d'autres, par Richard de Cornouailles. Il avait quitté la Palestine après ce dernier, mais il l'avait retrouvé en Italie auprès de l'empereur, probablement à Bénévent, et ils étaient revenus ensemble en France.⁷⁹ C'est lui apparemment qui a renseigné Renart sur les événements de 1240-41. L'*Escoufle* est donc postérieur au retour en France de Philippe et de ses compagnons (décembre 1241).

Il nous faut maintenant trouver à quel comte de Hainaut l'*Escoufle* a été dédié. Ce doit être Thomas de Savoie (1237-44), ou Jean I^{er} d'Avesnes (1244-56). Nous donnerons la préférence à ce dernier, dont nous savons qu'il était "par sa libéralité moult amé de tous chevalliers et gentils hommes,"⁸⁰ et qu'il devint plus tard le héros d'un roman qui porte son nom.⁸¹ Quant à la comtesse de Champagne—s'il s'agit de celle qui vivait à l'époque où le roman fut composé, ce qui n'est nullement prouvé—elle est Blanche de Bourbon, troisième femme de Thibaut de Navarre, comtesse de Champagne de 1232 à 1258.

Il est aussi fait souvent mention dans l'*Escoufle* d'un comte de Saint-Gilles, qui joue un rôle important dans le dénouement de

⁷⁷ *Les Chansons de Thibaut de Champagne, roi de Navarre*, éd. Wallensköld ("Société des anciens textes français" [Paris, 1925]), Nos. XIII, XVII, XXXIX, XLVI, XLIX, LV, et LVIII.

⁷⁸ *Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr*, "Hist. Occ.," II, 548; Joseph Bédier, *Les Chansons de croisade*, pp. 217-25.

⁷⁹ Sur Philippe de Nanteuil, voir *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXIII, 669-79; L. Fautrat, "Nanteuil, son abbaye et sa demeure seigneuriale," dans *Comité archéologique de Senlis* (1891), pp. 49-106.

⁸⁰ *Anciennes Chroniques de Flandre*, "Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France," XXIII, 339.

⁸¹ *La Fille du Comte de Ponthieu*, éd. Clovis Brunel ("Société des anciens textes français" [Paris, 1923]), introd., pp. lvi-lvii.

l'intrigue, et qui a l'habitude de se faire gratter en société. Il est aussi proche parent de Richard de Montivilliers:

7748

... Que li quens Richars vostre pere

Fu fix ma cousine germaine.

Il accompagne le jeune Guillaume en Normandie, et plus tard à Rome. Il est possible que ce soit Raimond VII, dernier comte de Toulouse et de Saint-Gilles, qui était, lui aussi, un proche parent de Richard de Cornouailles.⁸² Il fut un allié fidèle de Richard et de Henri III contre la France. Il était aussi un ami de Frédéric II, qui, en 1245, le chargea d'une ambassade auprès d'Innocent IV, laquelle n'eut pas plus de succès que celle du comte de Cornouailles en 1241.

LOUIS ANDRÉ VIGNERAS

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY

[A suivre]

⁸² Son père Raimond VI avait épousé Jeanne, sœur de Richard Cœur de Lion et de Jean sans Terre, et tante de Richard de Cornouailles.

THE ELECTUARIES OF THE ARCHPRIEST OF HITA

AFTER one of the many love affairs described by Juan Ruiz in his *Libro de buen amor* turns out unsatisfactorily for the archpriest,¹ his old go-between, Trotaconventos, urges him to form a liaison with some nun.² As an enticement she describes the libidinous natures of these creatures in detail³ and the archpriest may well have had misgivings as to whether or not he might measure up to the expectations of their desires. Trotaconventos, however, advises him beforehand that nuns are in the habit of providing their gallants with strange concoctions. Five stanzas are taken up with an enumeration of exotic substances—a passage probably serving as the inspiration to Rojas for his interesting account of Celestina's simples.⁴ The ingredients are described as follows:

- 1334 Muchof de letuarios lef dan muchaf de veresf,
dia çitron, codonate, letuario de nueesf,
otros de maf quantia de çahanoriaf rraheçesf
enbyan e otras cada dia arreuçesf.
- 1335 Cominada, alixandria, conel buen diagargante,
el diaçitron abatys, con el fino gengibrante,
miel rrofado, diaçiminio, diantiofo va delante,
e la rrofeta nouela que deuiera deçir ante.
- 1336 adraguea e alfenique conel eftomatricon,
e la garriofilota con dia margariton,
tria fandalix muy fyno con diafanturion,
que ef, para doñear, preçiado e noble don.
- 1337 ffabed que de todo açucar ally anda bolando,
poluo, terron e candy e mucho del rrofado,
açucar de confites e açucar violado,
E de muchaf otras guifaç que yo he oluidado.

¹ Juan Ruiz/ arçipreste de Hita/ *Libro de buen amor*/ *texte du XIV^e siècle*, ed. Jean Ducamin (Toulouse, 1901) (Salamanca text only), stanzas 1317 ff.

² *Ibid.*, stanzas 1332 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, stanzas 1340 ff. In many other places the lewdness of nuns engrosses the bard's attention, as in stanzas 1241, 1255 ff., 1466, and 1491.

⁴ Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina*, ed. Cejador y Frauca (Madrid, 1913), I, 80 ff. It is possible that Rojas likewise drew from the list of cosmetics in the Arcipreste de Talavera's *Corbacho*, Part II, chap. iii, "De como las mugeres aman a dyestro e a siniestro."

- 1338 Monpessler, alexandria, la nonbrada valencia,
 non tyenen de letuarios tantos nin tanta espeçia;
 los maf nobles presenta la dueña *que* maf preçia,
 en nobleçaa de amor ponen toda fu femencia.

For what purpose did the nuns give these prescriptions to their lovers? Certainly they were not intended for mere sweetmeats, as the different forms of sugar enumerated in stanza 1337 might suggest.⁵ Sugar was so rare in the Middle Ages and "so costly that it was used exclusively as a medicine, as were also most of the spices."⁶ Besides, the reference to Montpellier, the seat of a famous medical school, and the mention of other rather unpalatable ingredients such as "vile carrots," make this very unlikely. On the other hand, if they were considered as medicines, the drug satyrion—the satyr's plant—furnishes a clue as to what they were used for. This satyrion, the archpriest says, "is a precious and noble gift for mastering women." It is, in short, as Cejador admits, an aphrodisiac, and one of venerable antiquity. Again, the line, "en noblezas de amor ponen toda su femencia," if it refer to the ingredients mentioned in the stanza, further strengthens the belief that some others, at least, are surely stimulants for venery, and perhaps all.⁷

Fully one-half of the prescriptions in the oriental pharmacopeia introduced into Europe by the Arabs treat of sex stimulants.⁸ Moreover, the psychology behind these tonics seems to indicate that those are considered most efficacious which are most costly and rare. Even the plebeian potato, when first introduced into Europe, was hailed as a precious and powerful aphrodisiac,⁹ which it undoubtedly was, as the virtue of such things resides in the imagination, and familiarity had not yet brought contempt for the *Solanum tuberosum peruvianum*. The exotic is often erotic.

Two Hindu books on the art of love, the *Kama Sutra* of Vat-

⁵ Some of these articles, *gengibraiz, diadragum, rosat, violat, dyamargareton*, are most certainly regarded as medicines in a satire against doctors in one of the fabliaux, "La Bible Guiot de Provins," ll. 2630-60.

⁶ Charles H. LaWall, *Four Thousand Years of Pharmacy* (Philadelphia, 1927), p. 140. Cf. also p. 207: "In Ryff's book he says, 'Honey and sugars are the druggist's chief stock in trade. He uses it for his confects, electuaries, preserves, syrups, juleps, and other precious mixtures.'"

⁷ Elsewhere in the *Libro de buen amor* the archpriest evidences a knowledge of aphrodisiacs, e.g., stanza 941.

⁸ See B. de Villeneuve's note on his translation of the *Ananga Ranga* of Kalyana Malla (Paris, 1921), p. 74.

⁹ Howard W. Haggard, *Devils Drugs and Doctors* (New York, 1929), p. 322.

syayana¹⁰ and the *Ananga Ranga* of Kalyana Malla,¹¹ have furnished a number of aphrodisiacs for the infamous *Jardin parfumé* of the Aram Nefzaoui.¹² Although the last-named work dates from the early sixteenth century, there seems ample reason to believe that its matter was known to Arabian physicians much earlier.¹³ Many of the aromatic spices mentioned by all three works were introduced into Spain by the *Sandalini* or pharmacists before the twelfth century,¹⁴ and many of them figure among the ingredients mentioned by Juan Ruiz.¹⁵ These merit a close examination.

Honey is ubiquitous; it figures in practically every aphrodisiac from the most ancient times;¹⁶ but as it enters likewise into most other concoctions of the Middle Ages, it may be dismissed as a sort of pharmaceutical catalytic agent. *Diagargante* (tragacanth) and *estomatricon* (storax) are bases intended to give hardness and consistency to the prescription and hence may be found in almost any non-liquid medicine. It may seem surprising, however, to find nuts in general, and *alfenique* (a sweet paste of almonds) in particular, listed as stimulants to venery, but they figure, nevertheless, in no fewer than seven of the aphrodisiacs listed in the *Jardin parfumé* and the *Ananga Ranga*.¹⁷ Another very common stimulant for salaciousness is the archpriest's *gengibrante* (ginger), which occurs as a very important ingredient in seven of the aphrodisiacs of the *Jardin parfumé*.¹⁸

Most of the other substances mentioned by Ruiz are, like ginger, aromatic excitantives: *triasandalix* (sandalwood), *cominada* (cumin seed), and *diantoso* (cinnamon?). Partly of this nature, too, are *diacitron*, *diaciminio* (both candied citrus fruits), and *codonate* (pre-

¹⁰ Fr. trans. unsigned (Paris, 1928).

¹¹ B. de Villeneuve, *op. cit.*

¹² Trans. Isidore Liseux (Paris, 1922).

¹³ See *ibid.*, pp. 3 ff., for a brief history of the work.

¹⁴ LaWall, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

¹⁵ Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, *Correcho o reprobación del amor mundano* (Madrid, 1901), p. 92, also mentions most of these ingredients, and while by that time (1438) some of them were used for culinary purposes, it is quite clear from his remarks that they still preserved their aphrodisiacal properties in his mind.

¹⁶ Honey as well as wine was consumed in the Bacchic orgies. Lope de Vega, in his *Arcadia* ("BAE," XXXVIII, 111a), mentions honey as an aphrodisiac in the line, "La simiente del lino, con miel y pimienta, excita los deseos amorosos."

¹⁷ Nefzaoui, *op. cit.*, p. 225, gives a honey-and-nut aphrodisiac with the following explanation: "Un savant, nommé Djenilouss, (Galen) a dit, 'Celui qui se sentira faible pour le coit devra boire avant son sommeil un verre de miel bien épais et manger vingt amandes et cent graines de pin.'" These same ingredients figure in aphrodisiacs on pp. 235, 237, and in the *Ananga Ranga* on pp. 77, 80, and 81.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 225, 226, 227, 235, 237, 238, 240.

served quince).¹⁹ There are two which are chiefly odorous and hence, like perfumes in general, are considered as stimulants to venery.²⁰ These are *diamargariton* (the double yellow daisy or marigold) and *garrioflata* (the clove carnation),²¹ both frequent substitutes for saffron, in turn a common aphrodisiac.

One ingredient remains which may seem rather puzzling as an abettor to lust, and that is the archpriest's "vile carrots," given as he says, in "large quantities." It is, nevertheless, one of the oldest and most widely disseminated remedies for impotence. Pliny cites it with the explanation, "venerem stimulat copiosior in cibo sumpta."²² It is known as an aphrodisiac not only in Europe but in the United States at the present time, and the belief in its efficacy is almost as universal as the belief in ghosts. Furthermore, when the devout archpriest observes that the nuns alternate their various simples he shows that he was quite cognizant of a very old medical practice, that of varying medicines so that the virtue of no particular electuary would have time to "wear out"—a particularly necessary precaution with stimulants of this nature.

If, then, one may be justified in regarding the archpriest's electuaries as aphrodisiacs, we may have another bit of evidence of the profundity and penetration of his knowledge in the occultism of venery. The Book of Good Love will then truly seem, as the archpriest archly says in his prose introduction, a guidebook: "por que es umanal cosa el pecar, si algunos, lo que non los conssejo, quisiere[n] usar del loco amor, aqui fallaran algunas maneras para ello."

ELISHA K. KANE

KANE, PA.

¹⁹ Although these six ingredients are rather rare in the Hindu and Arabic aphrodisiacs, they were probably considered as *succedanea* or substitutes for oriental spices when the latter were unobtainable. The practice of using *succedanea* was widespread from the most ancient times (LaWall, *op. cit.*, p. 92). Drugs of the same nature, however, are common in the *Jardin parfumé*; note, e.g., the simples listed in the aphrodisiacs in the chapter "De ce qui augmente des petits membres et les rend superbes," p. 239 ff. Quince and citron peel have long been esteemed by the Chinese as restoratives, and in Spain fruits in general have this virtue imputed to them. Delicado, in his *La Lozana Andaluza* (ed. "Libros raros o curiosos," No. 1, p. 45), cites the old proverb, "Quien te hizo puta? El vino y la fruta."

²⁰ Space forbids a discussion of the aphrodisiacal effect of perfumes; the curious reader is referred to E. Tardif, *Etude critique des odeurs et des parfums, leur influence sur le sens génésique* (Bordeaux, 1898); Albert Hagen, *Die sexuelle Oosphresologie* (Charlottenburg, 1901); Albert Moll, *Untersuchen über Libido sexualis*.

²¹ For mention of the clove carnation as an incitative to lust see Nefzaoui, *op. cit.*, pp. 233 and 236. Spenser, in his *Shepherd's Calendar*, "April," refers to this flower in the line, "Bring Coronations and Sops in Wine, Worne of Paramours." "Sops in wine" is the clove carnation, called the *Flos delictorum* by the Romans because of its aphrodisiacal effect.

²² Plinii Secundi, *De medicina* (Leipzig, 1895), Lib. III, chap. xxxiii, "De pastinaca."

NOTES ON JOHN DRYDEN'S PENSION

THE financial affairs of Dryden have much concerned his biographers and critics. His character has constantly been under suspicion and his conduct reputed mercenary; and such fragmentary information about his pension as has from time to time come to light has yielded the most unflattering conclusions. Thus Macaulay assumed that Dryden's pension was withheld by James II until after his conversion, when the "King's parsimony speedily relaxed. Dryden's pension was restored: the arrears were paid up; and he was employed to defend his new religion both in prose and verse."¹ More recently Courthope, brushing aside a plea by Hooper on behalf of the poet, declared that

the real point is that, whereas no regular payment had been made to him since 1680, he began to receive an increased salary regularly after 1686, and within a short time of his joining the Roman Catholic communion. Under such circumstances it is impossible to relieve his memory of the suspicion that must surround the motives which prompted him to his change of faith.²

These statements—and the biographies of Dryden abound in similar ones—were not only unsupported when they were made, but they are now, in the light of more recent and complete information, demonstrably false. I wish to call attention to the fact that all the information regarding Dryden's pension, from 1670 to 1688, is now available in the *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1660-1689*.³ It seems particularly urgent to do so, in view of the neglect of this source of information both by E. K. Broadus, in his supposedly standard treatise on the office of poet laureate,⁴ and again by Montague Summers in the introduction to his pretentious edition of Dryden's dramatic works, only recently off the press.

Inasmuch as these prosaic facts have so many bearings on the interpretation of Dryden's character and writings, it is manifestly

¹ *History of England*, ed. C. H. Firth (London, 1914), II, 852.

² *A History of English Poetry*, III (1903), 517.

³ Ed. W. A. Shaw (8 vols.; London, 1904-23).

⁴ *The Laureateship* (Oxford, 1921), pp. 59-74.

impossible to discuss all their implications in an article.⁵ I shall attempt here merely a general statement of them, with a discussion of a few obvious controversial points.

I

By the patent of August 18, 1670, Dryden's pension was fixed at £200 a year. But he was later granted an additional annuity of £100 a year, which has caused some confusion to his biographers. Saintsbury referred to it as "independent of the appointment of the laureateship."⁶ Broadus, who might have consulted the *Calendar of Treasury Books*, thought that these two amounts were the traditional £200 for the post of historiographer royal and £100 for the laureateship.⁷ Montague Summers, who does not mention Broadus, has arrived independently at the same erroneous conclusion.⁸ The reason given by Broadus for his inference is that these are the sums attached to the respective offices in the patents to Ben Jonson and Davenant as poets laureate, to James Howell as historiographer after the Restoration, and again to Rymer as historiographer and Tate as poet laureate after the death of Shadwell.

But the records regarding Dryden's pensions do not correspond to this assumption. By the patent of August 18, 1670, the pension of £200 was made retroactive, "payable from the feast of St. John Baptist next after the death of Sir William Davenant" in 1668; so far as this pension was in intention attached to one office rather than to the other, it must have been to the poet-laureateship. But it is more probable that the arrangement was as indefinite as that of the additional pension, which will be discussed in a moment.

As first payment Dryden received on January 27, 1671, the sum of £500, for the two and a half years elapsed. The next four years he received his full annual payments on the following dates: April 20, 1672; March 10, 1673; December 31, 1673; and December 4, 1674.

⁵ I have elsewhere made a beginning, with a discussion of the legends connected with *The Spanish Fryar*. See "University of Michigan Publications in Language and Literature," VIII (1932), 123-32. Since writing the present article I find that Mr. Charles E. Ward, working independently, has been studying the subject of Dryden's pension. See his article in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, XXVII (1932), 206-10.

⁶ *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, I, 248-49 n.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 63.

⁸ *The Dramatic Works of John Dryden*, ed. Montague Summers (1931), I, lxxviii.

The pension for 1675 was paid in two instalments, on February 28, 1676, and on March 24, 1676, an ominous indication of treasury difficulties. The pension for 1676 was paid in full on February 20, 1677.

In comparison with what was to come, these were years of prosperity. But Dryden did not find this regularly paid pension sufficient for his needs. He had an ambitious project on his mind. Early in 1676, in the dedication to *Aurung-Zebe*,⁹ he expressed his dissatisfaction with his dramatic work and begged the Earl of Mulgrave to intercede for him with the King in order that he might be given leisure to write an epic poem on an English subject. It seems plausible, therefore, to suppose that the royal favor with which this project was received accounts for the additional annuity of £100. In the Treasury Minute Book, July 2, 1677, is the entry: "Mr. Dryden to have another 100 *l. per an.* added to his 200 *l. per an.* as Poet Laureat."¹⁰ In the King's Warrant Book, July 24, 1677, is entered a "Royal Warrant to the Clerk of the Signet for a privy seal for an annuity or yearly pension of 100 *l.* to John Dryden, his Majesty's Poet Laureate and Historiographer by way of addition to the 200 *l. per an.* granted him formerly."¹¹ Naturally, all money warrants continued throughout the reign of Charles to treat the two pensions in this manner, as a fee of £200 as poet laureate and historiographer, and another of £100 "by way of addition to his said fee." On the accession of James there would have been opportunity to attach each sum to its proper office, if any such distinct allotment had been understood. But the royal warrant of April 27, 1685, though it mentions the two sums as separate, continues the tradition of the previous reign. Dryden is designated "to be Poet Laureate and Historiographer Royal with the annuity or pension of 200 *l. per an.* and 100 *l. per an.* by way of addition for his encouragement diligently to attend the said employment."¹² There is therefore no evidence that the two pensions were considered, either by Dryden or by government officials, as belonging severally to the two offices.

⁹ *Aurung-Zebe* was advertised in the Easter-term catalogues in 1676 (ed. Arber, I, 236).

¹⁰ *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1676-1679*, V, Part I (1911), 462.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 698.

¹² *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1685-1689* (1923), pp. 139-40.

II

The additional annuity was granted under the Privy seal on July 31, 1677. Unfortunately, just at the moment when Dryden thought his pension was augmented, it began to shrink, and the epic poem was laid aside for labor for subsistence.¹³ Charles II was of course always in straits for money. But a long train of circumstances caused a more than ordinarily acute financial embarrassment in the last six or seven years of his reign. In some directions severe retrenchments were practiced. But many salaries, of ambassadors as well as of members of the King's household, fell in arrears.¹⁴ Dryden began to suffer in 1677, in spite of the fact that Danby, then leading minister and lord treasurer, appears to have been solicitous in his behalf.¹⁵ In that year he received only £100, by a warrant of July 27. A year later, June 8, 1678, he received £100 and £50, respectively, on the two pensions. From 1679 to 1683 he was usually paid twice each year, but each payment was only a quarter's salary. In 1683 Dryden was therefore receiving the pension due him for 1679 and 1680, and the money warrants so designated the payments. But there was no stoppage of Dryden's pension, such as we read about in biographies of him. Everyone, from the King down, hoped the arrears of government salaries and pensions could be made up, and the credit of the government restored. In fact, Charles made toward the end of his reign some strenuous efforts to straighten out his finances. Among those who benefited was the poet laureate, who in 1684 received two payments totaling £225, bringing his main annuity to Christmas, 1680, and his additional annuity to September 29 of the same year. After the accession of James, Dryden received one payment on arrears: on August 18, 1685, he was issued £150 for three quarters to September 29, 1681, on his main annuity. No further efforts seem to have been made to pay arrears to Dryden, and all later payments were made on the basis of his patent from James.

¹³ In his *Essay on Satire* (1693), Dryden discussed his design for an epic; but, he said, being encouraged only with fair words by King Charles II., my little salary ill paid, and no prospect of a future subsistence, I was then discouraged in the beginning of my attempt" (*Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, XIII, 31).

¹⁴ There are some illuminating passages in *The Diary and Correspondence of Henry Sidney*, ed. R. W. Blencowe (1843), I, 38, and II, 187-89.

¹⁵ In connection with the money warrant of July 27, 1677, there appears, in a letter to the Customs and Exchequer, the statement that "my Lord Treasurer desires this may be one of the first after the weekly payments." See *Calendar of Treasury Books*, V, Part I (1911), 704.

In considering these records, what is perhaps as striking as the exact halving of the annual payments is their regularity. For this Dryden later publicly acknowledged his gratitude to Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, who after the fall of Danby was made first lord of the treasury on November 19, 1679, and continued in that post until January, 1687, when James dismissed him because he would not turn Roman Catholic. In the dedication to *Cleomenes* (1692) Dryden thus addressed the Earl: "Your goodness has not been wanting to me during the reign of my two masters; and, even from a bare treasury, my success has been contrary to that of Mr. Cowley; and Gideon's fleece has then been moistened, when all the ground has been dry about it."¹⁶ That Dryden was at times in real distress during these years is evident from his famous undated letter to Rochester asking for "some small employment" and "a speedy answer for my present request of half a year's pension for my necessities."¹⁷ But he seems to have suffered his reduction of income with a commendable patience, and with a consciousness of unrewarded loyalty to a high cause which he almost despaired of. His patriotism in this crisis is expressed in the dedication to *The Duke of Guise* (1683) which he and Lee addressed to the Earl of Rochester:

And if ever this excellent government, so well established by the wisdom of our forefathers, and so much shaken by the folly of this age, shall recover its ancient splendour, posterity cannot be so ungrateful as to forget those who, in the worst of times, have stood undaunted by their king and country, and, for the safeguard of both, have exposed themselves to the malice of false patriots, and the madness of a headstrong rabble. But since this glorious work is yet unfinished, and though we have reason to hope well of the success, yet the event depends on the unsearchable providence of Almighty God, it is no time to raise trophies, while the victory is in dispute; but every man, by your example, to contribute what is in his power to maintain so just a cause, on which depends the future settlement and prosperity of three nations.¹⁸

¹⁶ *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, VIII, 217.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 247. It has been generally accepted that the poet was in 1683 appointed to the office of cloth and petty customs of the port of London, which was performed by deputy. Mr. Charles E. Ward has ingeniously and convincingly argued that the customs officer was a different John Dryden (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, April, 1932). This surmise is correct, as appears from a treasury flat of November 2, 1692, "for royal letters patent to constitute Richard Miller, gent., collector of the Customs and subsidies of cloth and petty Customs, London port, *loco* John Dryden, gent., deceased" (*Calendar of Treasury Books, 1689-1692* [1931], p. 1886).

¹⁸ *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, VII, 16.

The application is to Dryden as well as to the Earl. And when he was accused, in pamphlets attacking this play, of being mercenary, he made a reply which can be appreciated only in the light of the complete record of his pension payments:

If I am a mercenary scribbler, the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury best know: I am sure, they have found me no importunate solicitor; for I know myself, I deserved little, and, therefore, have never desired much. I return that slander, with just disdain, on my accusers: it is for men who have ill consciences to suspect others; I am resolved to stand or fall with the cause of my God, my king, and country; never to trouble myself for any railing aspersions, which I have not deserved; and to leave it as a portion to my children,—that they had a father who durst do his duty, and was neither covetous nor mercenary.¹⁹

It would not seem impossible, therefore, to credit Dryden with dignity, integrity, and loyalty through those seven critical years, so trying to both the king and his laureate.

III

Another great stumblingblock has been the fact that Dryden's patent under James was not issued until March 4, 1686, after he had gone over to the Roman Catholic church. As Courthope put it, "Under such circumstances it is impossible to relieve his memory of the suspicion that must surround the motives which prompted him to his change of faith." Perhaps a more full and accurate statement of the circumstances may help to allay the suspicion.

First of all, there does not appear to have been any doubt in 1685 about the continuance of Dryden's offices and pensions under James. On the title-page of *Threnodia Augustalis*, his funeral pindarique to the memory of Charles, he inscribes himself "Servant to His late Majesty, and to the Present King." And, as we have seen, on August 18, 1685, he was paid £150 on his arrears. The main point, however, is that the actual process of issuing the patent was initiated with the royal warrant to the attorney or solicitor-general on April 27, 1685. But the business of issuing a patent under the great seal was rather complicated, and often long delayed. It passed in succession through the offices of the attorney-general and of the secretary of state, the signet office, the lord privy seal's office, the office of the chancellor,

¹⁹ "The Vindication of *The Duke of Guise*," in *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, VII, 173-74. This pamphlet was entered in the Stationers' Register on April 2, 1683.

thence back to the privy seal, thence to the crown or patent office in chancery for engrossing, then finally to the lord chancellor for the affixing of the great seal.²⁰ This routine business not infrequently took months. In 1670 the preparation of Dryden's patent was begun at least as early as April 13, and was not completed until August 18. In 1689 Shadwell's patent was not issued until August 29. Or, to take a case more nearly parallel, the other John Dryden, who was collector of customs and who died in 1692, was also continued in his office under James, but his patent was not ready until February 20, 1686.²¹ Could it be that the King was negotiating with him also regarding a possible change of religion?

The fact is that the delay in the issue of Dryden's patent does not call for any sinister interpretation. It appears, indeed, to have been partly a pure oversight. On February 20, 1686, a money warrant for £150 was made out, in payment of Dryden's two pensions, up to September 29, 1685, but had to be canceled because the patent had not yet passed the privy seal; on March 9 it was replaced by a like warrant after the patent had been issued.²² Had the delay been intentional, to force Dryden to change his faith, it would certainly not have been prolonged as it was after his conversion, which Evelyn noted in his diary on January 19; and had the King issued any such secret orders, it would certainly not have been to the office of the privy seal, which until December, 1685, had been held by the staunchly Protestant Clarendon, and which after Clarendon's departure for Ireland had been put in commission.

It is evident how far Macaulay and Courthope were from a true knowledge of the facts. However, it is not profitable to censure them for their ignorance of information not available to them. What is really to the point is to see how often, in criticism of Dryden, facts have been given their worst possible construction, and, when facts were scarce, the account filled up with plausibilities. We are entitled to ask that these insinuations be translated into more precise and realistic language. When, for instance, Allardyce Nicoll, in a pleasant

²⁰ Sir William R. Anson, *The Law and Custom of the Constitution* (3d ed.; Oxford, 1907), II, 55, n. 4.

²¹ W. D. Christie, "Memoir of Dryden," *Globe ed.*, p. lv. n.

²² *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1685-1689* (1923), p. 604.

little volume on Dryden,²³ says that "the Poet Laureate of a Catholic king was more likely to succeed if he himself were a Catholic," what does this statement mean? Does it mean "succeed in getting his patent issued"? Or does it mean "succeed in getting his payments after his appointment"? Or does it covertly refer to something like those "visions of greater worldly advantage" which Christie thought were the motive of Dryden's conversion?²⁴ We have no direct evidence either that Dryden was subjected to improper influence by the King or that he was not. But he should not be convicted on flimsy evidence; and it might even be well at this late date to test more elaborately the hypothesis that Dryden was an honest man. The main purpose of this article, however, is to indicate that, whereas fragmentary information regarding his pensions has in the past been frequently used to damage his character, he may now be exonerated from many of these accusations by an appeal to the unquestionable facts regarding his patents and pensions, which are available for the entire period of his tenure of office.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

²³ *Dryden and His Poetry* (London, 1923), pp. 95-96.

²⁴ In the "Memoir," in the *Globe* edition, p. lviii. What these visions were Christie did not attempt to suggest, nor does he speak of them as though he thought they ever became reality for Dryden. They were of course nothing but the hypothetical filaments of the biographer.

MONBODDO AND ROUSSEAU

ON THE thirtieth of September, 1769, Boswell and his hero were dining at the Mitre. Boswell had for some time been subject to intermittent yearnings to return to the state of nature. There were few of the intellectual diseases epidemic in his day which he did not catch. As Miss Lois Whitney's researches have shown, certain forms of primitivism seem in the 1750's and 1760's to have ravaged Boswell's native region more extensively than they did the southern portions of the island;¹ and though his earlier hero-worship of Rousseau had now abated, some of its effects persisted. In any case, scarcely any topic could have been more serviceable to what for Boswell, when in London, was the chief end of life—to find subjects of conversation sufficiently provocative to stir the Great Bear to one of his best outbursts. Boswell, therefore, on this occasion, as he tells us, "attempted to argue for the superior happiness of the savage life, upon the usual fanciful topics."

JOHNSON. 'Sir, there can be nothing more false. The savages have no bodily advantages beyond those of civilized men. They have not better health; and as to care or mental uneasiness, they are not above it, but below it, like bears. No, Sir; you are not to talk such paradox: let me have no more on't. It cannot entertain, far less can it instruct. Lord Monboddo, one of your Scotch Judges, talked a great deal of such nonsense. I suffered *him*; but I will not suffer *you*.'—BOSWELL. 'But, Sir, does not Rousseau talk such nonsense?'—JOHNSON. 'True, Sir, but Rousseau *knows* he is talking nonsense, and laughs at the world for staring at him.'

BOSWELL. 'How so, Sir?'—JOHNSON. 'Why, Sir, a man who talks nonsense so well, must know that he is talking nonsense. But I am *afraid*, (chuckling and laughing,) Monboddo does *not* know that he is talking nonsense.'

¹ "English Primitivistic Theories of Epic Origins," *Mod. Phil.*, XXI (1924), 337-78. For an example of Boswell in a primitivistic mood, cf. *Letters of James Boswell*, ed. Tinker (1924), I, 98 (February 1, 1767): "You are tempted to join Rousseau in preferring the savage state. I am so too at times. When jaded with business, or when tormented with the passions of civilized life, I could fly to the woods," etc.

² *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1887), II, 73-74. For Dr. Johnson's view of the savage life, cf. also the *Adventurer*, No. 67 (1753). On the other hand, in the *Rambler*, No. 33 (1750), Johnson had drawn a picture of a primitive Golden Age which was brought to an end when men began to desire private property. "Then entered violence and fraud, and theft and rapine. Soon after pride and envy broke out in the world, and brought with them a new standard of wealth, for men, who till then thought themselves

Boswell, it need not be added, was not wholly crushed, even by this, and he presently observed that he had himself sometimes "been in the humor of wishing to retire to a desert." Than the retort which this pose drew there are few more perfectly Johnsonian: "Sir, you have desert enough in Scotland."²

When, then, Johnson and Boswell fell to talking of what we now call "primitivism," the two contemporaries whose names first occurred to them as representatives of that "paradox" were the author of the two *Discours de Dijon* and a Scottish Lord of Session whose theories were not to be published to the world until four years later, but were already notorious in the circles in which he moved in Edinburgh and London—the difference between the two, in Johnson's opinion, being merely that the Scot was a sincere, and the French writer an insincere, primitivist.

The truth was, however, that this, though not wholly groundless, was a seriously misleading conception of both; and the student of the history of ideas today who simply sets down Rousseau and Monboddó as "primitivists" misses the really important and interesting fact about them. That both sometimes dilated on the felicities of the savage life cannot, of course, be denied. Monboddó—or James

rich when they wanted nothing, now rated their demands, not by the calls of nature but by the plenty of others; and began to consider themselves poor, when they beheld their own possessions exceeded by those of their neighbors." In this version of the Golden Age, however, "Rest" takes the place of *Astraea*. In this passage Johnson had thus anticipated the so-called primitivistic and communistic strain in Rousseau's discourses. But this is, of course, not in the least surprising, since the opening part of the essay was simply a new mixture of bits from Aratus, Ovid, and Seneca, while Rousseau's discourses, in so far as they were primitivistic, were for the most part only further variations upon the same classical themes.

² Monboddó did not take Johnson's jokes in good part; in his *Origin and Progress of Language* (hereafter cited as *O. and P.*) (2d ed., 1789), V, 262–75, he assails the taste, the learning, and even the character of the Great Cham with a good deal of venom. Johnson was "neither a scholar nor a man of taste"; he was not "the twentieth part of the tythe of a critic"; he was "the most invidious and malignant man I have ever known, who praised no author or book that other people praised, and in private conversation was ready to cavil at and contradict every thing that was said, and could not with any patience hear any other person draw the attention of the company for ever so short a time." The explicit ground of this outburst, however, lay not in Johnson's attacks upon Monboddó (which Boswell had not failed to report to his countryman), but, on the one hand, in Johnson's disparagement of Milton's English and Latin style, and, on the other hand, in his remark that "*Paradise Lost* is not the greatest of heroic poems, only because it is not the first." In Monboddó's opinion, "the subject of the *Paradise Lost* is much too high for poetical imitation; whereas the story of Homer's *Iliad* is the best subject for an epic poem that ever was invented, or to speak more properly, that ever was chosen." Some of Monboddó's strictures on Johnson's literary criticism and his scholarship are not without point.

Burnet, as he was before his elevation to the bench—had entered Marischal College of the University of Aberdeen in 1728, being then fourteen years old, and had thus early come under the influence of Thomas Blackwell the younger; and some favorite ideas of the Aberdeen primitivists, with which he may have been indoctrinated at this tender age, continued throughout his life to influence his opinions on certain matters. Yet his chief significance in the intellectual history of Great Britain is not as a spokesman of primitivism, but as one of the initiators (in that country) of a new way of thinking which tended to destroy primitivism. And in this his position was parallel to that of Rousseau—at least of the Rousseau of the *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. That the comparatively original, innovating, historically momentous thing in that discourse was precisely the reverse of what most of the historians of French literature and of philosophy have represented it as being, I have shown in another essay.⁴ Though a good deal of the long-traditional primitivism still survived in the *Second Discourse*, the feature of it whereby it helped to introduce a new phase in the history of thought consisted in a sort of sociological evolutionism—and evolutionism is in essence, of course, the logical opposite of primitivism, though in the middle of the eighteenth century the two appear in several curious combinations. In the present paper I shall show that what I have previously observed with respect to Rousseau is also true of Monboddo; shall incidentally inquire whether the similarity between their ideas is attributable to Rousseau's influence upon the Scottish writer; and shall indicate the reasons for thinking that Monboddo went even farther in this way than the French writer.

In Monboddo's chief work, as in Rousseau's *Discourse*, the following six theses, all of them unusual and some of them startling novelties in the third quarter of the eighteenth century, are to be found.

1. That the state of nature, or original condition of mankind, was a condition of pure animality, in which our ancestors possessed no language, no social organization, almost no practical arts, and in general were in no way distinguished from the apes by intellectual attainments or mode of life.

⁴ *Mod. Phil.*, XXI (1923), 165-86.

2. That, therefore, the state of nature, properly so called, was not an ideal state, except with regard to the physical condition of the human animal. It was a phase from which it was not only inevitable but desirable that mankind should emerge. On this point, however, the utterances of both Rousseau and Monboddo are not wholly free from inconsistency; and both, though not truly primitivists, might be called "retrospectivists"; they both saw the best chapter of human history in an earlier, though by no means in the earliest, phase of man's development, though Rousseau found it in the pastoral stage of cultural development and Monboddo in ancient Greece.

3. That man and the "orang-outang" are of the same species; in other words, that the orang-outangs are a portion of the human race who, for some reason, have failed to develop as the rest of it has done; and that, therefore, we may see in these animals approximate examples of the characteristics of our early ancestors and of their manner of life.

4. That, as the foregoing propositions suggest, the chief psychological differentia of the human species consists not in any mental attributes or powers discoverable in mankind throughout its history, and therefore present from the beginning, but solely in a capacity for the gradual unfolding of higher intellectual faculties—what Turgot and Rousseau called *perfectibilité*. Thus man's history begins in a stage in which, in a sense, he was not yet human, in which he was essentially differentiated from other animals only by a latent potency of progress. It was not until he emerged from the state of nature that he began to be truly man.

5. That, therefore, human history—at least up to a certain point—should be regarded, not as it had very commonly been regarded, as a process of decline from a primitive perfection, a gradual dimming of the pure light of nature by which men had at first been illumined, but rather as a slow, painful ascent from animality, through savagery, to the life of a rational and social being.

6. That, consequently, there was needed a new historical science which should trace out the successive stages of this process of intellectual development and social evolution, and that for this purpose what was chiefly requisite was a far more thorough study than had ever yet been made of the life of contemporary savages—that is, of races

who still remained at one or another of the typical cultural stages through which the ancestors of civilized peoples must be supposed to have passed.

That all of these theses are to be found in Rousseau's *Discourse* I have previously shown; I shall now cite some illustrations of them from Monboddo—chiefly from the first volume of his *Origin and Progress of Language* (1773), and from some of his letters published in Professor Knight's volume, *Lord Monboddo and Some of His Contemporaries* (1900).

1. *Character of the state of nature.*—It is, says Monboddo, an established fact

that there have been in the world, and are still, herds of men (for they do not deserve the name of nations) living in a state entirely brutish, and, indeed, in some respects, more wild than that of certain brutes, as they have neither government nor arts. . . . Wherever there is progress, there must be a beginning; and the beginning in this case can be no other than the mere animal: For in tracing back the progress, where else can we stop? If we have discovered so many links of the chain, we are at liberty to suppose the rest, and conclude, that the beginning of it must hold of that common nature which connects us with the rest of the animal creation. From savage men we are naturally led to consider the condition of the brutes; between whom and the savages there is such a resemblance, that there are many who will hardly admit of any difference; and even betwixt us and them at the time of our birth, and for some considerable time after, there is not any material difference.⁵

Monboddo wrote similarly to his friend James Harris, the author of *Hermes*, in 1772:

I believe that I shall be thought by many to have sunk our nature too low. For though nobody has a higher idea than I of Human Nature, when it is improved by the arts of Life and exalted by Science and Philosophy, I cannot conceive it—before the invention of language—to have been in a state much superior to that of the brute. In short the *mutum ac turpe pecus* of Horace is my notion of man in his natural and original state; and in support of my philosophy, I have appealed to History—both ancient and modern—for proof of the brutal condition in which many nations have been found and are still to be found even though they have some use of speech. From which we may justly infer how much more abject and brutish their condition must have been before they had the use of speech at all.⁶

⁵ *O. and P.* (2d ed., 1774), I, 147.

⁶ Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

2. *Undesirability of the state of nature.*—Obviously it is inconceivable that Monboddó should have lamented man's emergence from this "abject and brutish condition" or have wished the race to return to it; on the contrary, he has expressly told us that human nature attains its high estate only "when it is improved by the arts of Life, and exalted by Science and Philosophy." Yet there are in Monboddó, as in Rousseau, passages which might easily be taken for eulogies of this state of nature which they had both depicted in such unalluring terms. With respect to Rousseau the apparent incongruity between these two positions was pointed out by Voltaire: "Pour raisonner conséquemment, tout ennemi du luxe doit croire avec Rousseau que l'état de bonheur et de vertu pour l'homme est celui, non de sauvage, mais d'orang-outang."⁷ The explanation of the supposed incongruity is, in great part, that both writers, when extolling the "natural condition of mankind," were referring primarily to the bodily superiority of the primeval brute and lamenting the physical deterioration of our species, which they believed to be due to the luxuries of civilized life. Thus Monboddó:

If it be true, as I most firmly believe it is, that the state in which God and Nature have placed man is the best, at least so far as concerns his body, and that no art can make any improvement upon the natural habit and constitution of the human frame; then, to know this natural state is of the highest importance and most useful in the practice of the several arts, and in the whole conduct of life. The object, for example, of the physician's art must be to restore, so far as possible, the body to that natural state, which must therefore be the standard of perfection of his art. The political philosopher, in like manner, will study to preserve the natural strength and vigor of the animal . . . by proper diet, exercise, and manner of life. . . . And lastly, every private man . . . if he is wise, will, if he knows this natural state, endeavor to bring himself back to it, as much as is consistent with the state of society in which we live; and will, after the example of the great men of antiquity, endure thro' choice, those hardships, such as they are commonly thought, which the savage only endures through necessity, without knowing that they are absolutely necessary to his happiness.⁸

⁷ *Dict. philos.*, art. "Luxe."

⁸ *O. and P.*, I, iii; also p. ii: "The political philosopher . . . will study to preserve the natural strength and vigour of the animal (human art can do it.) by proper exercise, and manner of life, and to prevent, as much as possible, the indulgence of ease and bodily pleasure, by which the race of civilized men, in all nations, has been constantly declining from the earliest times."

Monboddo's passages on the advantages of the state of nature, then, were a way of expressing an ideal rare in his age and, doubtless, greatly in need of propaganda—that of physical fitness. He inveighs against the “constant intemperance in eating and drinking” of his contemporaries, and laments that “athletic exercises, at least such as are proper to give any great degree of strength and agility to the body, are entirely disused.”⁹ Monboddo, in short, was an early and zealous, if ineffectual, prophet of physical culture and a preacher of the hygienic value of a rather Spartan regimen.¹⁰ His occasional praises of the state of nature are to be explained partly as survivals of an old convention, but chiefly as inspired by nothing more paradoxical than the laudable aim of improving the physical condition of eighteenth-century mankind. But of the ethical naturalism which was a frequent concomitant of primitivism and of the general philosophy of history which it implied, Monboddo was rather an adversary than an advocate. He believed in the deteriorating influence of the arts and sciences only in so far as they make for luxury and physical softness; and, unlike Rousseau, he did not think this an inevitable consequence of the cultivation of them. On the contrary, he maintained that “it is only by means of our arts and sciences that we have any advantages over savages.”¹¹

There cannot be virtue, properly so called, until man is become a rational and political animal; then he shows true courage, very different from the ferocity of the brute or savage, generosity, magnanimous contempt of danger and of death; friendship and love of the country, with all the other virtues which so much exalt human nature, but which we can as little expect to find in the mere savage as in the brute, or infant of our species.¹²

3. *Man and the orang-outang*.—Rousseau had buried his suggestion of our kinship with the apes in a note, where it doubtless escaped the attention even of many readers of his own time, as it has apparently eluded that of most subsequent historians. But Monboddo devoted more than a hundred pages to the defense of this hypothesis; and it

⁹ *Ibid.*, III, 453; cf. also I, 447 n.: “The fact no doubt is true, that man is at present more liable to disease than any other animal; but the blame ought to be laid where it truly lies, upon bad manners and institutions, and the many ingenious arts we have invented for the destruction of our bodies, not upon God and nature.”

¹⁰ The need for such preaching in Scotland at this period is illustrated in Dean Ramsay's *Old Scottish Conviviality* (1922).

¹¹ *O. and P.*, III, 455; cf. also pp. 463–66.

¹² *Ibid.*, I, 440.

was probably above all with this doctrine that his name was associated in the minds of most of his contemporaries, after the first volume of the *Origin and Progress* appeared in 1773.¹³ Here was an even richer theme than Monboddo's notions about savages for Johnson's gibes: "Sir, it is as possible that the *Ouran-Outang* does not speak, as that he speaks. However, I shall not contest the point. I should have thought it not possible to find a Monboddo; yet *he* exists." "It is a pity," said Johnson again, "to see Lord Monboddo publish such notions as he has done; a man of sense, and of so much elegant learning. There would be little in a fool doing it; we should only laugh; but when a wise man does it, we are sorry. Other people have strange notions, but they conceal them. If they have tails, they hide them; but Monboddo is as jealous of his tail as a squirrel." The history of science and philosophy in the ensuing century was to turn the edge of *this* jest very cruelly against Dr. Johnson. "Sir," he said to Boswell, about a month after the publication of the first volume of the *Origin and Progress*—"Sir, it is all conjecture about a thing useless, even were it known to be true. Knowledge of all kinds is good. Conjecture, as to things useful, is good; but conjecture as to what it would be useless to know, such as whether men went upon all four, is very idle."¹⁴ Johnson too was a man of uncommon sense and of much elegant learning; but that remark was perhaps the most profoundly stupid thing said by any man of his generation. To *reject* what Boswell calls "Lord Monboddo's strange speculation about the primitive state of human nature" was but natural conservatism, such as was to be expected of a man of Johnson's time and temper; but to pronounce the question raised unimportant and idle was to betray a strange blindness to the significance of ideas, a singular lack of the scientific and philosophic imagination. How Monboddo shines by comparison, in the conclusion—stated with the moderation of the scientific spirit—of his two chapters on the orang-outang!

¹³ Rousseau and Monboddo are the "recent writers" referred to by the "founder of anthropology," J. F. Blumenbach, in his doctoral dissertation, *De generis humani varietate nativa* (1775), as having "not blushed at advancing the doctrine of man's kinship with the oran-utan"—which Blumenbach here treats cavalierly as "needing no long refutation *apud rei peritos*." An English version of this may be found in Blumenbach's *Anthropological Treatises*, trans. T. Bendyshe (1865), p. 95.

¹⁴ *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. Hill, V, 46, 111; II, 259-60 (May 8, 1773).

That my facts and arguments are so convincing as to leave no doubt of the humanity of the orang-outang, I will not take upon me to say; but thus much I will venture to affirm, that I have said enough to make the philosopher consider it as problematical, and a subject deserving to be inquired into.¹⁵

The term "orang-outang" for Monboddo was apparently a generic one, applicable also to the gorilla and the chimpanzee, and, indeed, usually referring rather to these African apes than to the orang-outang of Borneo or Sumatra. His primary reason for asserting our probable consanguinity with these anthropoids was, so far as it went, of an entirely legitimate scientific sort: it consisted in the facts of comparative anatomy then recently set forth by Buffon and Daubenton in the *Histoire naturelle*. From these it appeared, as Monboddo says, that as to his body, he [the orang-outang] is altogether man, both outside and inside, excepting some small variations, such as cannot make a specific difference between the two animals, and I am persuaded are less considerable than are to be found betwixt individuals that are undoubtedly of the human species. And, more particularly, he has, says Mr. Buffon, the tongue and the other organs of pronunciation the same as those of man; and the brain is altogether of the same form and the same size. He and man have the same viscera . . . exactly of the same structure, and they alone have buttocks and calves of the leg, which make them more proper for walking upright than any other animal.¹⁶

Monboddo, however, was more interested in the "inward principle" of the orang, the "habits and dispositions of the mind," than he was in the animal's anatomy; and in these, even more than in the homologies of physical structure, he found evidence of the identity of species between these apes and ourselves. For evidence on these matters, however, he was compelled to rely largely upon travelers' tales; and he relied upon them in some instances rather more confidently than might have been expected of an experienced Scots advocate and judge. After citing a number of descriptions, some of them previously unpublished, of the manners and customs of the gorilla and the chimpanzee, he concludes:

The sum and substance of all these relations is, that the Orang Outang is an animal of the human form, inside as well as outside: That he has the human intelligence, as much as can be expected of an animal living without

¹⁵ *O. and P.*, I, 360.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

civility and the arts: That he has a disposition of mind mild, docile and humane: That he has the sentiments and affections common to our species, such as the sense of modesty, of honour, and of justice; and likewise an attachment of love and friendship to one individual so strong in some instances, that the one friend will not survive the other: That they live in society and have some arts of life; for they build huts, and use an artificial weapon for attack and defence, *viz.*, a stick; which no animal merely brute is known to do. . . . They appear likewise to have some civility among them, and to practise certain rites, such as that of burying the dead. It is from these facts that we are to judge whether or not the Orang-Outang belongs to our species. Mr. Buffon has decided that he does not. Mr. Rousseau inclines to a different opinion. The first seems to be sensible of the weight of the facts against him. . . . There are some of our naturalists . . . who having formed systems without facts, adjust the facts to their prejudicated opinions, believing just as much of them as suits their purpose, and no more. Of this number, I take Mr. Buffon to be, who has formed to himself a definition of man, by which he makes the faculty of speech a part of his essence and nature; and having thus defined man, he boldly avers, that the pure state of nature, in which man had not the use of speech, is a state altogether ideal and imaginary, and such as never had any real existence.¹⁷

Monboddo has often been ridiculed, in his own time and since, for his affecting picture of the gentlemanly gorilla and the civil chimpanzee; and it can hardly be denied that he had formed a somewhat too exalted conception of the intellectual parts and the charm of temperament of our cousins of the Simiidae. Of the refinement of the female of the species, in particular, he cites some rather surprising examples from "Bontius the Batavian physician" and others; it would seem that the apes of the gentler sex are modest to the point of prudery, and of a somewhat excessive sensibility. Yet Monboddo, while exaggerating on one side, was nearer to the truth than most later writers until a very recent time. A number of the accomplishments which he attributed to the higher anthropoids they have now been shown—after a century and a half of scientific skepticism—

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 289-93. Monboddo is here probably referring chiefly to Buffon's passage on this subject in *Histoire naturelle*, Tome XIV (1766); cf. especially pp. 3-4, 30-33, 37-38, 41-42. Buffon's conclusion is: "Je l'avoue, si l'on ne devoit juger que par la forme, l'espèce du singe pourroit être prise pour une variété dans l'espèce humaine." Nevertheless, "quelque ressemblance qu'il y ait entre l'Hottentot et le singe, l'intervalle qui les sépare est immense, puisqu'à l'intérieur, il est rempli par la pensée, et au dehors par la parole." Monboddo seeks to eliminate this twofold "interval" by asserting the fairly considerable intelligence of the orang-outang, and by arguing that man was originally devoid of speech.

actually to possess. Köhler has proved that chimpanzees are not only tool-using but tool-fabricating animals; and the "almost human" traits of these apes have been shown by the careful studies of Yerkes and Kearton.¹⁸

So considerable, however, are the attainments credited to the orang-outang by some of the observers whom Monboddo quotes that the necessary inference, from his own point of view, would be that the orang-outang does *not* represent to us the primitive condition of mankind—as Monboddo elsewhere depicts it, and as Rousseau had done before him—but a more advanced stage; and, indeed, he draws this inference himself. In the pure state of nature, Monboddo holds, with Rousseau, that man was a "solitary wild beast" having "no natural propensity to enter society," and therefore living neither in herds nor in family groups. But since the orang-outangs, according to Monboddo's informants, sometimes

live together in society; act together in concert, particularly in attacking elephants; build huts, and no doubt practise other arts, both for sustenance and defence: . . . they may be reckoned to be in the first stage of human progression, being associated, and practising certain arts of life; but not so far advanced as to have invented the great art of language.¹⁹

Like Rousseau, it will have been noted, Monboddo believed in the *bonté naturelle* of the orang-outang; that animal, though not capable of morality properly so called, has, and *a fortiori* the truly primitive members of our species had, a "mild" and "gentle" disposition. And like Rousseau, again, Monboddo takes occasion, in this connection, to emphasize his dissent from Hobbes:

¹⁸ Köhler, *The Mentality of Apes* (1924); Koffka, *The Growth of the Mind* (1924), chap. iv; Yerkes, *Almost Human* (1925); C. Kearton, *My Friend Toto* (1925). Some of the observations of Yerkes may be cited as close parallels to some passages of Monboddo's: "Again and again it has been demonstrated in connection with tests of intelligence that the orang-utan, the chimpanzee and the gorilla can and do use objects effectively to attain such desired ends as foods, freedom, and opportunity to play. The results of experiments . . . are indicative of an order of intelligence which certainly suggests the human, if it does not closely approach it." "The primates exhibit in varying forms the principal types of emotion which appear in man. . . . It is not at all surprising that scientists should feel that the chimpanzee is more nearly human in its emotional life than in any other way. . . . This picture of the tender aspect of the emotional life of the monkeys and great apes may give the reader reason to pause and reflect. Are we humans after all so nearly unique in our flaunted altruism?" Kearton's young chimpanzee Toto was hardly at all less "human" than Monboddo's "orang-outangs."

¹⁹ *O. and P.*, I, 268-69.

I would not have it understood, that I believe, as Mr. Hobbes does, that man is naturally the enemy of man; and that the *state of nature* is a state of war of every man against every man. This is such a state as neither does exist, nor ever did exist, in any species of animals. And, however ingenious Mr. Hobbes may have been, (and he certainly was a very acute man, and much more learned than those who now-a-days set up for masters of philosophy), it is plain to me, that he did not know what man was by nature, divested of all the habits and opinions that he acquires in civil life; but supposed that, previous to the institution of society, he had all the desires and passions that he now has.²⁰

This, obviously, implied that the desires and ambitions which make man pugnacious and set him at variance with his fellows have been developed since he adopted the habit of living in society, and that his antisocial passions are thus in some sense a product of the social state. This idea plays a great part in Rousseau's *Second Discourse*; as I have pointed out, while he rejects Hobbes's psychology when picturing man in the state of nature, he accepts it as true—and increasingly true—of man in civilized society, so that the stage which in Rousseau is at four removes from his "state of nature" corresponds pretty exactly to the "state of nature" of the philosopher of Malmesbury.²¹ But Monboddo does not make a great deal of the point; he is less the psychologist and moralist than Rousseau, and takes, also, a much less unfavorable view of human nature under the conditions of social life.

Was Monboddo, unlike Rousseau, an evolutionist in the biological as well as in the anthropological sense—i.e., did he accept the general hypothesis of the transformation of species which had already been propounded by Maupertuis and Diderot?²² So far as his published treatise is concerned, the answer would at first seem to be in the negative. The importance he attaches to showing that man and the orang-outang are of the same species might naturally be taken to imply that animals of different species cannot be descended one from the other or from common ancestors. And in one passage he expressly denies intending to suggest that we are akin to the monkeys as well as to the great apes:

Though I hold the Orang Outang to be of our species, it must not be supposed that I think the monkey or ape, with or without a tail, participates

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

²¹ *Mod. Phil.*, XXI, 176-79.

²² See my "Some Eighteenth Century Evolutionists," *Popular Science Monthly*, LXV (1904), 240-51, 323-27.

of our nature; on the contrary, I maintain that, however much his form may resemble ours, yet he is, as Linnaeus says of the Troglodyte, *nec nostri generis, nec sanguinis*.²³

The principal reason he gives for this is that "neither monkey, ape nor baboon, have anything mild or gentle, tractable or docile, benevolent or humane, in their dispositions; but on the contrary, are malicious and untractable, to be governed only by force and fear, and without any gravity or composure in their gait and behaviour, such as the Orang Outang has." Thus those traits of the *bandarlog* which to some have seemed rather to indicate their kinship with humanity are cited by Monboddo as evidence that they cannot be related to the orang-outang, nor, therefore, to us.

Yet there are reasons for thinking that his real belief inclined to the wider hypothesis which in the passage last cited he disclaims. In a letter of June, 1773—that is, very shortly after the publication of the first volume of his book—he writes:

I think it is very evident that the Orang-Outang is above the simian race, to which I think you very rightly disclaim the relation of brother, though I think that race is of kin to us, though not so nearly related. For the large baboons appear to me to stand in the same relation to us, that the ass does to the horse, or our gold-finch to the canary-bird.²⁴

This, apparently, can only mean that all the apes, the monkeys, and man are descended from common ancestors. As Monboddo would not have classified all of these as belonging to a single species, he implied that the descent of one species from another is possible. And even in the *Origin and Progress of Language* the same belief is more than hinted at. Monboddo introduces into that work several accounts of the existence, in various parts of the world, of men with tails.²⁵ There was, for example, a Swedish naval lieutenant, whose good faith was vouched for by no less a person than Linnaeus, who had

²³ *O. and P.*, I, 311.

²⁴ Knight, *Lord Monboddo and His Contemporaries*, p. 85.

²⁵ The existence of tailed men had been asserted by Pliny *Nat. hist.* vii. 2 and not rejected by Linnaeus, *Systema naturae* (2d ed., 1766), I, 33; and Robinet had devoted a chapter of his *Gradation naturelle des formes de l'être* to the evidence for the reality of *hommes à queue*, which to him illustrated how *finement nuancée* is the scale of being. The (tailless) pongo "is connected with man by an infinity of similarities; man must be connected by other characteristics with species far below the pongo" (*De la nature*, V [1768], 160). Robinet, however, held the pongo and orang-outang to be "not truly men" but "an intermediate species which fills up the transition from the ape to man" (*ibid.*, p. 151). He has a place with Maupertuis and Diderot among the French pioneers of evolutionism.

reported that, when sailing in the Bay of Bengal, he had "come upon the coast of one of the Nicobar Islands, where they saw men with tails like those of cats, and which they moved in the same manner."²⁶ A similar story had been recorded by the great Harvey. It was not, however, necessary to go to the remote parts of the earth for examples; Monboddo offered "to produce legal evidence by witnesses yet living" concerning a teacher of mathematics in Inverness who "had a tail half a foot long," which he carefully concealed during his life, "but was discovered after his death, which happened about twenty years ago." What is certain, at any rate, as Monboddo points out, is that we all have rudimentary tails, in the form of the *os coccygis*. Now the anthropoids, as Monboddo knew, have no tails, or at least none much more developed than man's, and his stories of *homines caudati*, therefore, were without pertinency in an argument for our kinship with the orang-outang. He himself remarks that he relates "this extraordinary fact concerning our species as a matter of curiosity, though it belong not to [his] subject, except in so far as it tends to give us more enlarged views of human nature." But the occasional existence of tailed men, and the presence of vestigial tails in both man and orang-outang, would tend to indicate that both are descended from remote ancestors who were endowed with that pleasing and useful member. And that Monboddo meant, by these considerations, to suggest that hypothesis may be seen from a remark in one of his footnotes:

Those who have not studied the variety of nature in animals, and particularly in man, the most various of all animals, will think this story, of men with tails, very ridiculous; and will laugh at the credulity of the author for seeming to believe such stories; But the philosopher, who is more disposed to inquire than to laugh and deride, will not reject it at once, as a thing incredible, that there should be such a variety in our species, as well as in the simian tribe, which is of so near kin to us.²⁷

Now "the simian tribe" meant, in Monboddo's terminology, not the orang-outangs, but the monkeys; so that he here affirms the probable truth of the view which on another page he seems to deny. One may conclude, therefore, that he accepted in principle the general possibility of the transformation of species and that he definitely asserted, as a probable hypothesis, the community of descent of most or all of

²⁶ *O. and P.*, I, 258.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 262.

the Anthropeidea. He was thus (so far as I know) the first British champion of evolutionism, or near-evolutionism, in biology; he anticipated Erasmus Darwin's *Zoönomia* by twenty years.²⁸

Monboddo, of course, was well-enough aware of the sort of sentimental objection which his hypothesis would evoke—the objection against evolutionism which a Bishop of Oxford repeated on a famous occasion nearly a century later. But he met it stoutly, with virtually the reply which the contemporary evolutionist usually employs:

As to the vulgar, I can never expect that they should acknowledge any kinship with those inhabitants of the woods of Angola; but that they should continue, thro' a false pride, to think highly derogatory from human nature, what the philosopher, on the contrary, will think the highest praise of man, that, from the savage state, in which the Orang Outang lives, he should, by his own sagacity and industry, have arrived at the state in which we now see him.²⁹

4. *The specific differentia* of "homo sapiens."—Whatever room for dispute there may be—Rousseau had said in the *Discourse on Inequality*—respecting the differences between men and other animals,

there is one very specific quality which distinguishes them, and about which there can be no controversy: this is the *faculté de se perfectionner*, a faculty, which, with the aid of circumstances, gives rise one after another to all the rest, . . . whereas an animal is, at the end of a few months, what he will be all his life, and his species at the end of a thousand years is what it was the first year of the thousand.

To the same theme Monboddo frequently recurs.

There is no *natural* difference between our minds and theirs [the brutes'] and the superiority we have over them is *adventitious*. . . . Allowing that . . . we can go farther than the brute with any culture can go (which I believe to be the case), this is saying no more than that . . . we have by Nature greater capabilities than they. . . . I deny that there is any other difference betwixt us and them.³⁰

Man is called a "rational animal," but "this specific difference of *rational* does not consist in the energy or actual exercise of the faculty of reason, nor even in the possession; else the new-born infant would not be a man." And what is true of the individual is true of the race;

²⁸ Akenside had, however, somewhat obscurely foreshadowed the theory of descent in *Pleasures of the Imagination* (1744), Book II; cf. G. R. Potter in *Mod. Phil.*, XXIV (1926), 55-64.

²⁹ *O. and P.*, I, 360; cf. also pp. 437-41.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 147-49.

the species had at the outset a mere "*capability* of intellect and science," which long ages were required to develop. Monboddo as well as Rousseau had been anticipated in this remark in an anonymous writing published before 1740, whose author remarks:

I cannot but look on the common definition of man as *animal rationale*, to be somewhat defective. I think it might be altered for the better, though that would not be compleat, to define him *animal rationabile*, if *rationabile* may be allowed to signify the capacity of receiving, and not the actual exercise, of reason. . . . This definition is proper, whereas Aristotle's is not which makes him *animal rationale*, as if he were actually and not only potentially so, by his specific nature, without any foreign help or culture.³¹

5. *The ascent of man.*—As all the foregoing implies, the attributes commonly regarded as distinctive of humanity were not created ready-made, but were arduously and slowly attained. Monboddo happily sums up the most significant thesis of his doctrine by an adaptation of a line of Vergil's: "*Tantae molis erat humanam condere gentem.*" In short, nothing that is distinctive of man was primitive, and nothing that is most excellent in him comes by nature alone.

Monboddo was thus an evolutionist in a profounder sense than is implied by a belief in the identity of primitive man with the orang-outang. He was one of the few men of his time who really had what may be called the genetic habit of mind. The Aristotelian distinction "between the power of becoming anything, and the actually *being* that thing," or "between *capacity* and *energy*," is fundamental to his whole doctrine. And he declares that

this distinction runs through all nature, in which there is a perpetual progress from one state to the other, and that nothing is at first what it afterwards becomes. Now if anyone says that the human mind is an exception from this law of nature, he must prove it. But this he will never be able to do.³²

Monboddo therefore did not shrink from saying—however much "some pious and well disposed persons" might "take offence"—that

³¹ *A Philosophical Dissertation upon the Inlets to Human Knowledge* (reprinted; Dublin, 1740), pp. 47, 57. Forty years after Monboddo Destutt de Tracy was still enunciating the same doctrine with the enthusiasm of a preacher of a new insight: "We have received from this admirable Nature—that is to say, from our own organization—only the possibility of perfecting ourselves. When we came from her hands, . . . we possessed only the germ of the means of attaining knowledge. . . . Thus we are entirely works of art, that is, of our own labor; and we have to-day as little resemblance to the man of nature, to our original mode of existence, as an oak has to an acorn or a fowl to an egg" (*Elémens d'idéologie* [1814; 3d ed., 1817], chap. xv, p. 289).

³² *O. and P.*, I, 438.

"the chief prerogative of human nature, the rational soul," is "of our own acquisition, and the fruit of industry, like any art and science, not the gift of nature." Whatever such a doctrine be called, it certainly cannot be called "primitivism." Yet even in our own day learned authors may be found declaring that Monboddo was "a primitivist of the extremest type."³³

This way of thinking, moreover, struck at the heart, not merely of primitivism, but also of that uniformitarian conception of human nature with which from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries primitivism was commonly associated.³⁴ This was, indeed, already being undermined by the "theory of climates," especially through the influence of Montesquieu. But a still more serious attack upon it was that made by these early social evolutionists, Rousseau and Monboddo. Commenting upon the theories of certain political philosophers, Monboddo writes:

I must enter a caveat against the manner of reasoning which I observe is very common on this subject. In the first place, an hypothesis is laid down that man was from the beginning, in all ages and nations of the world, the same, or nearly the same, with what he is at present in Europe, or other civilized parts of the world. For it is a maxim constantly in the mouths of such reasoners, that human nature is and always has been the same. And, secondly, supposing this maxim to be undeniable, they argue, from the manners and customs of such men as we are; and because such and such institutions are practised by civilized nations, they conclude that they must have been always in use, and as old as the human race. . . . But I think I am at liberty to set hypothesis against hypothesis, and to suppose that man, so far from continuing the same creature, has varied more than any other being that we know in Nature. And tho' his nature may in some sense be said to be the same, as he has still the same natural capabilities as he had from the beginning; yet this nature is, by its original constitution, susceptible of greater change than the nature of any other animal known. And that, in fact, it has undergone the greatest changes, is proved, I say, first from the general history of mankind, by which it appears, that there has been a gradual progress in arts and manners among the several nations of the earth; . . . and secondly, from particular relations of the customs and manners of barbarous nations, both antient and modern.³⁵

³³ H. N. Fairchild, *The Noble Savage*, p. 331. Mr. Fairchild also notes, however, that Monboddo (incongruously) "anticipated the theory of evolution."

³⁴ On this see the writer's "The Parallel of Deism and Classicism," *Mod. Phil.*, XXIX (1932), 281 ff.

³⁵ *O. and P.*, I, 443-44.

In such a passage we may see one of the foreshadowings of that distrust of universal formulas, that distinctively evolutionary relativism in political and social philosophy, which was to be among the traits chiefly differentiating the thought of the nineteenth century from that of the earlier modern centuries—but which has been but imperfectly acquired even yet by a large part of mankind.

6. *Conception of an evolutionary universal history.*—Monboddo's original grand design had been to do on a large scale what Rousseau had attempted in a brief, sketchy way in the *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. In 1766 Monboddo wrote to Harris that he projected a *History of Man* in which I would trace him through the several stages of his existence; for there is a progression of our species from a state little better than mere brutality to that most perfect state you describe in ancient Greece, which is really amazing, and peculiar to our species.³⁶

This plan he was compelled regretfully to abandon, finding it "too extensive for [his] abilities and the time he had to bestow on it"; and he therefore only attempted a part of the original program, consisting chiefly of an account of the origin and evolution of language. On this narrower theme he contrived to write some three thousand pages in the intervals of his judicial duties, and when about sixty years of age and upward. With his linguistic speculations we are not here concerned; what is to the point is merely that, like Rousseau, he had caught a vision of a possible new sort of history—and that he insisted that such a science must rest upon a careful study of the actual life of peoples in the earlier stages of social evolution.

Those who have studied the history of *man*, not of particular nations only, that is, have studied history in the liberal and extensive view of discerning the nature of *man* from fact and experience, know very well, that all nations, even the most polished and civilized, of which we read in history, were originally barbarians. . . . Whoever, therefore, would trace human nature up to its source, must study very diligently the manners of barbarous nations, instead of forming theories of *man* from what he observes among civilized nations. Whether we can, in that way, by any discoveries hitherto made, trace man up to what I suppose his original state to have been, may perhaps be doubted; but it is certain that we can come very near it.³⁷

Of the possibility of accomplishing such a task in his own time, Monboddo was unduly sanguine; but he expressed a just conception

³⁶ *Lord Monboddo and His Contemporaries*, p. 50. ³⁷ *O. and P.*, I, 145.

of the program to be followed, if a too favorable one of his actual achievement even with regard to the history of language, when he declared: "My system is founded, not upon hypothesis, but on the history of man, collected from facts, in the same manner as we collect the history of any other animal."²⁸

Much of Monboddo's doctrine, then, and the part of it which was most revolutionary in his time, may fairly be said to be an elaboration of a group of interrelated ideas to be found in Rousseau's *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, published twenty years before the *Origin and Progress of Language*. Was the similarity due to the spontaneous occurrence of the same thoughts to two contemporary minds, or to the direct influence of the earlier works of the one writer upon the other? The question cannot be answered with certainty. Both were, of course, familiar with the Epicurean accounts of primeval man and of the gradual evolution of society, in Lucretius, Cicero, and Horace, especially the passage in Horace's *Satires* i. 3 (ll. 99 ff.) which Monboddo took as the motto of his book. Much of Rousseau's *Second Discourse* may be described as an ingenious combination of this anti-primitivistic strain in the classical tradition with the primitivistic strain in it represented, in different ways, by Ovid and Seneca. As Monboddo was primarily a classical scholar and an enthusiast for antiquity, it is entirely possible that, as Knight has assumed, his ideas on these matters were first suggested to him through his reading of ancient authors.²⁹ Both, also, were familiar with the facts disclosed by the progress of comparative anatomy in their century, and both were eager readers of descriptions, some of them recent, of primitive peoples and of the anthropoid apes. In particular, the increasingly numerous descriptions of those by no means noble savages, the Hottentots, by voyagers of the late seventeenth and eighteenth cen-

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 444.

²⁹ Monboddo himself writes: "My opinion on this subject will, I know, be thought new and singular; but it is only an antient opinion revived; for I have shown that it was the opinion of the antient philosophers, as many as have treated of the original state of man before society or civilization" (*ibid.*, p. v). The classical writers cited in support of this (*ibid.*, pp. 368 ff.) are Horace, Lucretius, Plato (*Laws*, Book I; *Theaetetus* 186 C; *Timaeus* 47a), Diodorus Siculus, Cicero. Cf. also I, 298: "I have endeavored to support the antient definition of man, and to shew that it belongs to the Orang Outang, though he have not the use of speech."

turies tended strongly to suggest an unfavorable view of the "original condition of mankind."⁴⁰

On the other hand, it is certain that Monboddo had read Rousseau's *Discourse* before writing his book; that the latter contains a number of passages very similar to some of Rousseau's; and that Monboddo was one of the most enthusiastic admirers whom Rousseau found among his own generation. "Even the philosophers (one only excepted) seem to know nothing of this state" of nature, Monboddo declares; the one exception is identified in a footnote as "Mr. Rousseau, a very great genius, in my judgment, but who has been thought whimsical and odd, for having said so much in commendation of the natural state of man."⁴¹ Again, when insisting upon the indispensability of a study of existing savages if we would know the early condition of all mankind, instead of attempting "to form a system of *human* nature from what" we "observe among civilized nations only," Monboddo refers to

⁴⁰ The combination of the almost universally current conception of nature as a continuum of forms (chain of being) with the facts reported about the Hottentots had long since led some writers of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries to approximate, without actually anticipating, the doctrine which was to be propounded by Rousseau and Monboddo. Cf. the remark of Sir John Ovington, *Voyage to Surat* (1696), recently cited in this journal by R. W. Frantz (XXVIII [1931], 55-57): "The Hottentots are 'the very Reverse of Human kind . . . so that if there's any medium between a Rational Animal and a Beast, the Hottentot lays the fairest claim to that species.'" Monboddo's theory had been still more nearly adumbrated by Blackmore and Hughes in the *Lay Monastery*: "Nothing is more surprising and delightful than to observe the Scale or gradual Ascent from Minerals to Plants, from Plants to Animals, and from Animals to human Nature. 'Tis easy to distinguish these Kinds, till you come to the highest of one, and the lowest of that next above it; and then the Difference is so nice, that the Limits and Boundaries of their Species seem left unsettled by Nature to perplex the curious, and to humble the proud Philosopher. As Man, who approaches nearest to the lowest class of Celestial Spirits (for we may justly suppose a subordination in that excellent Order), being half body and half Spirit, becomes the *Aequator*, that divides in the Middle the whole Creation, and distinguishes the Corporeal from the Invisible Intellectual World; so the Ape or Monkey, that bears the greatest Similitude to Man, is the next Order of Animals below him. Nor is the Disagreement between the basest Individuals of our species and the Ape or Monkey so great, but that were the latter endow'd with the Faculty of Speech, they might perhaps as justly claim the Rank and Dignity of the human Race, as the salvage *Hottentot*, or stupid native of Nova Zembla. . . . The most perfect of this Order of Beings, the *Orang Outang*, as he is called by the natives of *Angola*, that is, the Wild Man, or Man of the Woods, has the Honour of Bearing the greatest Resemblance to Human Nature. Tho' all that Species have some Agreement with us in our Features, many Instances being found of Men of Monkey Faces; yet this has the greatest Likeness, not only in his Countenance, but in the Structure of his Body, his Ability to walk upright, as well as on all fours, his Organs of Speech, his ready Apprehension, and his gentle and tender Passions, which are not found in any of the Ape Kind, and in various other respects" (No. 5 [1714], p. 28. This was a new edition of the *Lay Monk* [1713]).

⁴¹ *O. and P.*, I, iii. That Rousseau had not represented "the natural state of man" as, on the whole, the ideal one, Monboddo was, of course, well aware.

"Mons. Rousseau, in his Treatise on the *Inequality of Men*, where he ridicules the folly of those who think they understand human nature, because they know the character and manners of their own nation, and perhaps some of the neighboring nations; and very wisely tell us that *man* is the same in all ages and in all nations." "I am very happy," adds Monboddo, "to find that my notions, both with respect to the original state of human nature, and the origin of language, agree so perfectly with the notions of an author of so much genius and original thought, as well as learning."⁴² Monboddo, however, does not say that he derived his theory of the humanity of the orang-outang from Rousseau, and rather implies that he hit upon the great idea independently.

Mons. Rousseau, in his work above quoted, note 10, has collected the several accounts given of this animal by travellers, and seems to agree with me in opinion that he belongs to our species, rejecting with great contempt the notion of those who think that speech is natural to man. Now, if we get over that prejudice, and do not insist, that other arts of life, which the Orang Outangs want, are likewise natural to man, it is impossible we can refuse them the appellation of men.

All that can be confidently asserted on the matter is that Rousseau and Monboddo were brothers-in-arms, the two chief champions in their age of the six connected theses set down at the beginning of this paper, and that Rousseau's priority in the enunciation of all of them renders Monboddo's originality in these points somewhat questionable. He developed them, however, far more fully, devoting to them the greater part of an entire volume; by most educated persons in Great Britain in the eighties he was probably looked upon as their originator; and he with some wavering extended Rousseau's doctrine of the identity of species of man and the chimpanzee into the hypothesis of the common descent of all the anthropoids, and suggested by implication a general law of organic evolution. In this last he had already been anticipated by at least three French writers; but of this he was apparently unaware, as were most of his British contemporaries. It is not surprising, therefore, that a friend and countryman of his, at his death in 1799, claimed for him—and therefore for Scotland

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 152; cf. p. 381: "that singular genius which our age has produced, Mr. Rousseau."

—the credit which by some was apparently then given, as it has often been since, to the author of *Zoōnomia*:

Though Darwin now proclaims the law,
And spreads it far abroad, O!
The man that first the secret saw
Was honest old Monboddo.
The architect precedence takes
Of him that bears the hod, O!
So up and at them, Land o'Cakes,
We'll vindicate Monboddo.⁴³

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

⁴³ From lines "To the Memory of Lord Monboddo" by Lord Neaves, a colleague of the same bench, cited by Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

CHARLES READE AND MONTAIGNE

CHARLES READE, as is well known, was very careful about documenting his novels. When he had a theme of a story in mind, he at once set to work industriously reading all manner of books and newspapers and making copious notes. It is, therefore, with interest that we notice in one of his letters the statement, "I have contrived to leave behind me two small brown volumes called 'Voyages de Montaigne.' . . . Will you send them down with all despatch, accompanied, if possible, by 'Herder's Epidemics,' which I lent Dr. Dickson? It is, however, 'Montaigne' I am most in want of."¹

The volume referred to is the diary kept by Montaigne on a journey through Switzerland, Germany, and Italy during the years 1580-81. Though of no great literary worth itself, it affords many details concerning the life in these countries in the sixteenth century. Moreover, so pressing a demand for the volume as we find in Reade's letter suggests that he wishes to make some use of these facts for one of his novels. *The Cloister and the Hearth*, because of its historical character, is, of course, most nearly related to the period and countries described by Montaigne, and a comparison of the two books reveals undoubted borrowing on the part of Reade.² The borrowed facts are used especially for providing local color in the descriptions of Rome. A study of corresponding passages in the two authors, besides indicating the extent of Reade's borrowings, will throw much light on his methods of working up his historical background.

The various ceremonies on Holy Thursday in Reade are clearly drawn from Montaigne. The Pope's progress through the streets is thus described in the novel:

Presently the Pope came pacing majestically at the head of his cardinals, in a red hat, white cloak, a capuchin of red velvet, and riding a lovely white Neapolitan barb, caparisoned with red velvet fringed and tasselled with gold; a hundred horsemen, armed cap-à-pie, rode behind him with their lances

¹ C. L. Reade and Compton Reade, *Charles Reade* (London, 1887), II, 145.

² A recent paper by Emerson Grant Sutcliffe (*Studies in Philology*, XXVII [1930], 64-109), which came to my attention after finishing this investigation, mentions an article in the *Century Magazine* (XXIX [November, 1884], 67 ff.), composed of letters, in one of which Reade says he read Montaigne's diary before writing *The Cloister and the Hearth*. [MODERN PHILOLOGY, February, 1933]

erected, the butt-end resting on the man's thigh. The cardinals went uncovered, all but one, de Medicis, who rode close to the Pope and conversed with him as with an equal. At every fifteen steps the Pope stopped a single moment, and gave the people his blessing, then on again.³

A similar account of the Pope's riding through the streets occurs in Montaigne, though the episode does not take place on Holy Thursday.

Le troisieme de Janvier 1581, le Pape passa devant nostre fenestre ... Aupres de lui estoit le Cardinal de Medicis qui l'entretenoit couvert, et le menoit disner chez lui. Le Pape avoit un chapeau rouge, son accoustremant blanc, et capuchon de velours rouge, comme de coustume, monté sur une hacquenée blanche, harnachée de velours rouge, franges et passessant d'or. Il monte à cheval sans secours d'escuyer, et si court son 81^e an. De quinze en quinze pas, il donnoit sa benediction. Apres lui marchoint trois Cardinaus, et puis environ çant homes d'armes, la lance sur la cuisse, armés de toutes pièces, sauf la teste.⁴

Reade, continuing with the observances of Holy Thursday, now proceeds as follows:

... Soon the Pope and cardinals, who had entered the church by another door, issued forth, and stood with torches on the steps, separated by barriers from the people; then a canon read a Latin Bull, excommunicating several persons by name, especially such princes as were keeping the church out of any of her temporal possessions.

At this awful ceremony Gerard trembled, and so did the people. But two of the cardinals spoiled the effect by laughing unreservedly the whole time.

When this was ended, the black cloth was removed, and revealed a gay panoply; and the Pope blessed the people, and ended by throwing his torch among them; so did two cardinals. Instantly there was a scramble for the torches: they were fought for, and torn in pieces by the candidates, so devoutly that small fragments were gained at the price of black eyes, bloody noses, and burnt fingers; in which hurtling his holiness and suite withdrew in peace.⁵

A passage very similar to Reade's occurs in Montaigne, who is now writing about Holy Thursday:

Le Judy-saint au matin, le Pape en pontificat se met sur le premier portique de S. Pierre, au second etage, assisté des Cardinaus, tenant, lui, un flambeau à la mein. Là d'un costé, un Chanoine de St. Pierre lit à haute vois une bulle latine où sont excommuniés une infinie sorte de jans, entre autres les Hugue-

³ Charles Reade, *The Cloister and the Hearth*, ed. with Introduction and notes by C. B. Wheeler (Oxford University Press, 1915), p. 454. My references are all to this edition.

⁴ Michel de Montaigne, *Journal de voyage en Italie*, ed. A. Armaingaud (2 vols.; Paris, 1928-29), I, 208-9. I cite this as Montaigne hereafter.

⁵ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, pp. 454-55.

nots, sous ce propre mot, et tous les Princes qui detiennent quelque chose des terres de l'Eglise: auquel article les Cardinaus de Medicis et Caraffe, qui estoit jouignant le Pape, se rioient bien fort. ... Apres cela le Pape jeta cete torche alumée contre bas au peuple, et par jeu ou autrement, le Cardinal Gonsague un'autre; car il y en avoit trois alumées. Cela choit sur le peuple; il se faict en bas tout le trouble du monde à qui ara un lopin de cete torche, et s'y bat-on bien rudement à coup de pouin et de baton. Pendant que cete condamnation se lit, il y a aussi une grande piece de taffetas noir qui pant sur l'acoudoir dudict portique, davant le Pape. L'excommunication faite, on trousse ce tapis noir, et s'en descouvre un autre d'autre color; le Pape lors done ses benedictions publiques.⁶

The resemblance between these passages is, of course, so close as to prove borrowing. It is to be noted, however, that Reade makes some changes in his version. He omits mention of the Huguenots as not suitable in his novel; he emphasizes the cardinals' lack of tact in laughing; he enlivens the style generally; and he alters the order of details so as to close with a rough-and-tumble fight instead of a blessing, thus securing a more spirited climax.

Reade now continues his borrowing from Montaigne's descriptions of ecclesiastical ceremonies. Both in *The Cloister and the Hearth* and in Montaigne, the Vera icon, in "a square fame, like that of a mirror," is exhibited to the people by a priest with red gloves. The people gaze upon the sight with cries of pity and with tears in their eyes.⁷ In both books, thereafter, a procession of flagellants passes, many of them laughing as they whip themselves. Certain of the bystanders offer them wine, but the flagellants usually accept it only to wet, and thus separate, the strands of their lashes, which are clotted with blood. In both authors, furthermore, a younger woman takes pity on a mere boy in the procession. In Montaigne, "Il se tourna vers nous, et lui dit, en riant: Basta, disse che fo questo per li lui peccati, non per li miei." In Reade, "the fair urchin" acts similarly but in language more suited to English readers: "'Basta,' said he laughing, 'tis for your sins I do it, not for mine.'" ⁸ Reade then suitably completes the episode, from his own imagination, and connects it with one of the actors in the novel by making Gerard's friend, Fra Colonna, the skeptic and worshiper of antiquity, derive the practice from the Roman festival of the Lupercalia.

⁶ Montaigne, I, 260-62. ⁷ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 455; Montaigne, I, 262.

⁸ Montaigne, I, 264-65; *The Cloister and the Hearth*, pp. 455-56.

Reade next describes the mass on the same day, borrowing the details from Montaigne's account of a mass at St. Peter's on Christmas:

Le pape donna à communier à plusieurs autres; et officioint avec lui à ce service les cardinaus Farnese, Medicis, Caraffa et Gonzaga. Il y a un certain instrumentant à boire le calisse, pour prouvoir la surté du poison. Il lui sembla nouveau, et en cete messe et autres, que le pape et cardinaus et autres prelates y sont assis, et, quasi tout le long de la messe, couverts, devisans, et parlans ensamble. Ces ceremonies samblent estre plus magnifiques que devotieuses.⁹

The passage in Reade is similar, but more condensed:

Next they got into one of the seven churches, and saw the Pope give the mass. The ceremony was imposing, but again spoiled by the inconsistent conduct of the cardinals, and other prelates, who sat about the altar with their hats on, chattering all through the mass like a flock of geese.¹⁰

After this more lively rendering, Reade develops a hint from a note in the 1774 edition of Montaigne. In this, the phrase *pour prouvoir la surté du poison* had as a footnote: "Pourvoir, *providere*, se précautionner contre le poison. L'essai avoit déjà été fait par le Préguste."¹¹ Reade, seeing in this suggestion an opportunity for an additional bit of anticlericalism, has the Eucharist tasted by the special official or "Preguste" before the Pope. Hereupon the naïve and devout Gerard, believing implicitly in transubstantiation, objects that such caution is unnecessary, and the skeptic Colonna begins a lively harangue with "So says faith; but experience tells another tale."

Again, on the same day, Gerard and his friar go to see the so-called heads of Peter and Paul at the Lateran. The passage is clearly drawn from Montaigne's account of the same ceremony. The details coincide perfectly; in both accounts we read of the preliminary ringing of bells, the drawing of a curtain by jerks, the shape and appearance of the heads themselves, and the practice of exhibiting them thrice and each time only long enough for the spectators to say an "Ave Maria."¹² To this scene, similarly, Reade attaches a discourse by the skeptic friar, ascribing the ceremony to ancient influence and deriving it specifically from the old Roman practice of showing the family "imagines" at funerals.

⁹ Montaigne, I, 200-201.

¹⁰ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 456.

¹¹ *Journal du voyage de Michel de Montaigne* (2 vols.; Rome and Paris, 1774), I, 283.

¹² Montaigne, I, 266-67; *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 457.

On an earlier day in *The Cloister and the Hearth*, Gerard and Fra Colonna attend, at the palace of Cardinal Bessarion, a banquet which is described as follows:

They were about a mile from the top of that table; but, never mind, there they were; and Gerard had the advantage of seeing roast pheasants dished up with all their feathers as if they had just flown out of a coppice instead of off the spit: also chickens cooked in bottles, and tender as peaches. But the grand novelty was the napkins, surpassingly fine, and folded into cocked hats, and birds' wings, and fans, etc., instead of lying flat. This electrified Gerard: though my readers have seen the dazzling phenomenon without tumbling backwards chair and all.

After dinner the tables were split in pieces, and carried away, and lo under each was another table spread with sweet-meats. The signoras, and signorinas, fell upon them and gormandized; but the signors eyed them with reasonable suspicion. . . .

As soon as the ladies had disported themselves among the sugar plums, the tables were suddenly removed, and the guests sat in a row against the wall. Then came in, ducking and scraping, two ecclesiastics with lutes, and kneeled at the cardinal's feet and there sang the service of the day; then retired with a deep obeisance: in answer to which the cardinal fingered his skull cap as our late Iron Duke his hat.¹³

For this account, so rich in local color, Reade is indebted to the description of two different feasts in Montaigne. One of these was served by the governor of the Castle of Sant'Angelo, and at this banquet the ladies were seated, whereas their husbands had to remain standing in order to serve them:

On y servit force volaille rotie, revetue de sa plume naturelle comme vivfe; des chappons cuits tout entiers dans des bouteilles de verres. ... La table des Dames, qui estoit de quatre plats, se levoit en pieces, et au dessous de celle-là il s'en trouva un' autre toute servie et couverte de confitures.¹⁴

The other banquet in Montaigne was given by the Cardinal de Sens. This was a much more sedate affair, beginning with a very long responsive grace by two chaplains and furnishing, in the middle, some reading of Scripture for the guests' entertainment. The napkins in Reade's account are, I suspect, derived from a suggestion in this passage; the religious ceremony at the end certainly is.

Audessus de cela [large silver squares with salt-cellars before the places], il y a une serviette pliée en quatre; sur cete serviette le pain, le cousteau, la forchette, et le culier. Audessus de tout cela une autre serviette, de laquelle

¹³ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, pp. 445-46.

¹⁴ Montaigne, I, 228.

il se faut servir, et laisser le demeurant en l'estat qu'il est. ... La table fut levée soudein apres les graces, et les chaises arrangées tout de suite le long d'un costé de la salle, où M. le Cardinal les fit soir apres lui. Il y survint deus hommes d'Eglise, bien vetus, à tout je ne sçay quels instrumans dans la mein, qui se mirent à genouil devant lui, et lui firent entendre je ne sçay quel service qui se faisoit en quelque Englise, il ne leur dit du tout rien: mais come ils se relevarent apres avoir parlé et s'en alloint, il leur tira un peu le bonnet.¹⁵

Reade's account, though exceedingly colloquial, is much more lively than the plain narrative of Montaigne. It is filled, likewise, with a genial merriment appropriate to a feast. The author increases the vividness of the phraseology and likewise develops hints in the original, by drawing upon his own imagination. Thus *volaille rotie, revetue de sa plume naturelle comme vive* becomes "roast pheasants dished up with all their feathers as if they had just flown out of a coppice instead of off the spit." *Il leur tira un peu le bonnet* is made more vivid and brought up to date for Victorian readers by the rendering "fingered his skull cap as our late Iron Duke his hat." Finally, the mention of delicacies on the undertable before the ladies is built out with Reade's colorful description of how "the ladies disported themselves among the sugar plums," while the husbands held back suspiciously.

Another borrowed episode concerns an exorcism. Montaigne describes the event as follows:

On le [the man possessed by a devil] tenoit à genous devant l'Autel, aiant au col je ne sçai quel drap par où on le tenoit ataché. Le Pretre lisoit en sa presence force oresons et exorcismes, commandant au Diable de laisser ce cors, et les lisoit dans son breviaire. Apres cela il detournoit son propos au patiant, tantost parlant à lui, tantost parlant au Diable en sa personne, et lors l'injuriant, le battant à grans coups de pouin, lui crachant au visage. Le patiant repondoit à ses demandes quelques responses ineptes: tantost pour soi, disant come il santoit les mouvemans de son mal; tantost pour le Diable, combien il creignoit Dieu, et combien ces exorcismes agissoient contre lui. Apres cela qui dura longtems, le Pretre, pour son dernier effort, se retira à l'Autel et print la Custode de la mein gauche, où estoit le *Corpus Domini*; en l'autre mein tenant une bougie alumée, la teste ranversée contre bas, si qu'il la faisoit fondre et consommer, prononçant cepandant des oresons, et au bout des paroles de menasse et de rigur contre le Diable, d'une vois la plus haute et magistrale qu'il pouvoit. Come la premiere chandele vint à defaillir pres de ses doigts, il en print un'autre, et puis une seconde, et puis la tierce. ... Il nous dict que ce Diable là estoit de la pire forme, opiniatre, et qui couteroit bien à

¹⁵ Montaigne, I, 207-8.

chasser; et à dix ou douze Jantil 'homes qui etions là, fit plusieurs contes de cete sciance, et des experiances ordineres qu'il en avoit, et notammant que le jour avant il avoit deschargé une fame d'un gros Diable, qui, en sortant, poussa hors cete fame par la bouche, des clous, des epingles et une touffe de son poil.¹⁶

Reade transfers this narrative to *The Cloister and the Hearth*, but changes some of the details:

There they found the demoniac forced down on his knees before the altar with a scarf tied round his neck, by which the officiating priest held him like a dog in a chain.

Not many persons were present, for fame had put forth that the last demon cast out in that church went no farther than into one of the company: "as a cony ferreted out of one burrow runs to the next."

When Gerard and the friar came up, the priest seemed to think there were now spectators enough; and began.

He faced the demoniac, breviary in hand, and first set himself to learn the individual's name with whom he had to deal.

"Come out, Ashtaroth. Oho! it is not you then. Come out, Belial. . . . Come out, Nebul. Aha! what, have I found ye? 'tis thou, thou reptile; at thine old tricks. Let us pray!" . . .

The priest then rose from his knees, and turning to the company said, with quiet geniality, "Gentles, we have here as obstinate a divell as you may see in a summer day." Then, facing the patient, he spoke to him with great rigour, sometimes addressing the man, and sometimes the fiend, and they answered him in turn through the same mouth, now saying that they hated those holy names the priest kept uttering, and now complaining they did feel so bad in their inside.

It was the priest who first confounded the victim and the culprit in idea, by pitching into the former, cuffing him soundly, kicking him, and spitting repeatedly in his face. Then he took a candle and lighted it, and turned it down, and burned it till it burned his fingers; when he dropped it double quick. Then took the custodial; and showed the patient the Corpus Domini within. Then burned another candle as before, but more cautiously. . . .

He then told the company in the most affable way several of his experiences; concluding with his feat of yesterday, when he drove a great hulking fiend out of a woman by her mouth, leaving behind him certain nails, and pins, and a tuft of his own hair, and cried out in a voice of anguish, "'Tis not thou that conquers me. See that stone on the window sill. Know that the angel Gabriel coming down to earth once lighted on that stone: 'tis that has done my business.'¹⁷

¹⁶ Montaigne, I, 229-30.

¹⁷ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, pp. 449-51.

Reade's framework, in this passage, is drawn from Montaigne, but the details are enlivened or elaborated. Reade first compares the maniac to "a dog in a chain" and thereafter adds, for the sake of humor, the spectators' fear that the devil will take refuge in one of them. Next he introduces two new elements: the priest's desire to have a good audience and a list of nine different devils. In his elaboration of Montaigne, Reade thereafter renders the action gradually more intense by making the priest pass from rebuking to actually buffeting the patient, whereas in the French diary the two steps are intermingled. In these happenings, too, as indeed in the whole passage, Reade manifests considerable anticlericalism. Thereafter, in both authors, the exorciser has recourse to burning candles and presenting the custodial, with the humorous addition, in Reade, of the priest's burning his fingers. At the end of each account the priest tells the spectators about his previous experience with devils, particularly with *un gros Diable*, who in English becomes "a great hulking fiend." The narrative by the priest entails, in Reade, a colorful rejoinder from the skeptic Fra Colonna.

Another notable feature of Reade's re-working of the passage from Montaigne is that Reade has interpolated in it two borrowings from the *Itinerary* of Fynes Moryson. In an account of the casting out of a devil, Moryson relates that the exorciser "did so familiarly call that Divell and all his Legion by their names, as I much wondered thereat." This suggestion has been developed by Reade into his more effective list of devils: "Come out, Ashtaroth. Come out, Belial. . . ." In the same passage, too, Moryson tells a story of another routed devil pointing to "a stone in the next window, upon which the Angel Gabriel stood . . . crying that hee was cast out by the holinesse of that stone, not of the Priest."¹⁸ This event Reade has added to Montaigne's details of the *gros Diable*.

Various scattered details in *The Cloister and the Hearth* are taken from Montaigne. Gerard's remark in a letter, "Ye enter no Italian town without a bill of health, though now is no plague in Europe" may be drawn from several remarks to this effect in the diary.¹⁹ Gerard's praise of Italian "artful fountains and figures that move by

¹⁸ Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary* (4 vols.; Glasgow, 1907-8), III, 446.

¹⁹ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 413; Montaigne, II, 6, and elsewhere.

sup
wit
sim
Ron
et l
eglic
one
"I t
nest
an I
phra
" A
" A
" A
surnam
" M
" T
" T
I, 196.

water and enact life"²⁰ may be prompted by Montaigne's lengthy descriptions of these, for inspecting such contrivances was a real hobby with him. Fra Colonna's remark "our Roman women in particular have by lifelong study learned the wily art to show their one good feature, though but an ear or an eyelash, at a jalosy, and hide all the rest" is drawn from Montaigne,²¹ but the rest of the sentence, as Wheeler observes, is from Moryson. Again, Claelia Cesarini, the name of the Roman princess whose love for Gerard plays so notable a rôle in the novel, is taken from Montaigne's telling of his visit to the palace of "Jan George Cesarin,"²² where he saw the portrait of "la seignora Claelia—Fascia Farnèse, sa fame, qui est, sinon la plus agreable, sans compareson la plus eimable fame qui fût pour lors à Rome, ni que je sçache ailleurs."²³ The name is borrowed in the English novel, but so is not the personality of Reade's haughty Roman beauty, who slaps her maids viciously and is ready to put armed men in ambush to butcher an enemy. Finally, the boat of Gerard and his fellow-revelers, pulled on the Tiber by a team of buffaloes, is suggested by Montaigne's "Ils font tirer leurs bateaus à la corde contremont la riviere du Tibre, par trois ou quatre paires de buffles."²⁴

Another obvious larger borrowing is Fra Colonna's discussion of the superior grandeur of ancient Rome, as shown by its ruins, compared with the modern city. This is a boiled-down version of Montaigne's similar reflections. In particular, the Frenchman compares modern Rome built on the top of the ancient city to "des nids que les moineaus et les corneilles vont suspandant en France aus voutes et parois des eglises que les Huguenots viennent d'y demolir." In Reade's hands, one should note, this simile takes on a form more suitable to England: "I tell thee this village they call Rome is but as one of those swallows' nests ye shall see built on the eaves of a decayed abbey."²⁵ Thus does an Italian character talk a Frenchman's sentiments in an Englishman's phraseology.

²⁰ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 414.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 510; Montaigne, I, 259.

²² A note on the opposite page in the 1774 edition (II, 79) gives an Italian form of the surname with final -i.

²³ Montaigne, I, 282-83.

²⁴ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 482; Montaigne, I, 268.

²⁵ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, pp. 448-49; Montaigne, I, 214-18 and some points from I, 196.

Two final passages which Reade borrows for the local color of Rome describe two executions witnessed by Montaigne. Reade, however, exchanges the order of the two. One execution was of two brothers, servants who had killed their master.

On les tenailla, puis coupa le pouing devant ledict palais, et l'ayant coupé, on leur fect mettre sur la playe des chappons qu'on tua et entr' ouvrit soudene-mant. Ils furent deffaits sur un echaffaut et assommés à tout une grosse massue de bois et puis soudain esgorgés.²⁶

In the novel the two brothers become one, the execution is described rather more fully, and Reade skilfully introduces Gerard, who has just become a friar and is being hardened by his superiors to the beholding of suffering:

The criminal was brought to the house of the murdered man, and fastened for half an hour to its wall. After this foretaste of legal vengeance his left hand was struck off, like his victim's. A new killed fowl was cut open and fastened round the bleeding stump . . . ; and the murderer, thus mutilated and bandaged, was hurried to the scaffold; and there a young friar was most earnest and affectionate in praying with him, and for him, and holding the crucifix close to his eyes.

Presently the executioner pulled the friar roughly on one side, and in a moment felled the culprit with a heavy mallet, and falling on him, cut his throat from ear to ear.²⁷

The second execution in *The Cloister and the Hearth* is somewhat longer in both the novel and the diary, but the details are similar.²⁸ The delinquent was a notorious robber, who had killed people even when it was not necessary. A priest accompanies him to the scaffold. The prisoner is first strangled, and then cut into quarters—the second proceeding evoking more horror than the first from the spectators. Finally in Montaigne, "un ou plusieurs Jesuistes ou autres, se mettent sur quelque lieu hault, et crient au peuple, qui deça, qui delà, et le preschent pour lui faire goustier cet exemple." Reade, seeing his opportunity, develops this final hint by having Gerard, the attendant priest, deliver a most eloquent sermon to the people, a sermon that for the first time reveals that he is a born preacher. It is to gain this climax that Reade changed the order of the two executions.

From the earlier part of Montaigne's volume concerning Germany,

²⁶ Montaigne, I, 211-12.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 508-9; Montaigne, I, 209-11.

²⁷ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, pp. 507-8.

The Cloister and the Hearth derived much less. One remark comparing France and Germany seems surely to be adopted from Montaigne: "In France worshipful men wear their hats and their furs indoors, and go abroad lighter clad. In Germany they don hat and furred cloak to go abroad; but sit bareheaded and light clad round the stove."²⁹

Montaigne, praising the stoves of Germany, had said: "Aussi là où nous [the French] prenons nos robes de chambre chaudes et fourrées entrant au logis, eus [the Germans] au rebours se mettent en pourpoint, et se tiennent la teste decouverte au poile, et s'habillent chaudement pour se remettre à l'air."³⁰

The account of smokejacks for turning spits at Augsburg may be occasioned by Montaigne's mention of them in Switzerland and in the Tyrol.³¹ Devices in the Augsburg gardens to squirt unsuspecting guests with water may be a similar borrowing.³² Once more, Gerard, masquerading as a nobleman in Germany, gives his arms to an inn where he has stayed, a circumstance which may be drawn from two mentions of this practice in Montaigne.³³

The most extensive borrowing concerning Germany, however, is the description of the postern gate at Augsburg. Both Montaigne's and Reade's accounts are detailed and too long to quote. Both agree in mentioning the following steps for entering the city: two preliminary guards, an iron gate opened by machinery, a covered bridge, speaking to the porter for the first time, his ringing of a bell, the consequent opening of other barriers, a dark hall, another gate, a lighted hall, a small vessel in which to put the entry fee (two batzen for a horseman), and another door letting one out into the city.³⁴ Wheeler in his notes to the novel believes this to come from Moryson's *Itinerary*.³⁵ Moryson, however, is far less specific than Reade. There is no mention of the first two guards; no distinction of the various gates (only "divers gates" are spoken of); no mention of the bell-ringing, of the two halls, or of the two batzen. One detail, nevertheless, is appropriated by Reade from Moryson, the name of the gate, "Der Einlass."

²⁹ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 411.

³⁰ I, 52.

³¹ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, pp. 400 and 414; Montaigne, I, 39, 120.

³² *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 400; Montaigne, I, 94.

³³ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, p. 394; Montaigne, I, 86, 101.

³⁴ *The Cloister and the Hearth*, pp. 398-99; Montaigne, I, 96-98.

³⁵ I, 41.

These numerous borrowings from Montaigne Reade has made excellent use of in his novel. Though he takes a large number of details, he never treats them awkwardly. They are rather as clay in the hand of the sculptor, for he molds them to his will and infuses life into them. His language is colloquial, so colloquial indeed that at times it may be offensive, but it is, at the same time, lively and even racy. Not seldom, too, a humorous note is added, whether the genial fun over the ladies' gorging on sweetmeats or the anticlerical satire of the priest engaged in exorcism.

Then, too, Reade, by no means treats an episode at the same length that Montaigne does. Occasionally he finds the diary rambling, as in Montaigne's lengthy reflections on ancient Rome, and then he condenses it. On the other hand, aiming at greater vividness, he frequently expands a borrowed passage. At times this is merely by the addition of lively descriptive phrases, such as in his account of the pheasants that seemed just to have flown out of a coppice; at times, he builds out an episode extensively, as when he developed Montaigne's remark about the Jesuits at an execution into Gerard's maiden speech in his career as a preacher. Now and then, too, he takes bits from two authors and welds them together so ably that one would suppose they had always belonged together.

Finally, Reade's sense of the dramatic is clearly evident in his handling of borrowings. Whereas Montaigne in his informal diary is not much interested in the dramatic moment, Reade does not allow such a situation to escape from his grasp. He has, in particular, a sense of climax and thus develops his scenes gradually until they reach their highest points. Thus whereas Montaigne merely records the events he saw when the Pope cast down his torch and blessed the people or when the priest attempted to exorcise the devil, Reade consciously alters the order of the details so as to end with what seems to him the strongest. In a word, then, Reade's borrowings, close to Montaigne as they are, have been modified artfully and show the hand of a most skilful story-teller.

ALBERT MORTON TURNER

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY AESTHETICS

John W. Draper's *Eighteenth Century English Aesthetics: A Bibliography* ("Anglistische Forschungen," Heft 71; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1931) is a valuable work. Favorable reviews have appeared: by R. S. Crane, *MP*, XXIX (1931), 251-52; by F. T. Wood, *ES*, LXVI (1931), 279-81; by R. D. Havens, *MLN*, XLVII (1932), 118-20. Each has printed additional titles, and it is worth noting that among them there are only four duplications. Here are some contributions for a second edition. None of the titles has appeared in the foregoing reviews.

I should like to point out first that the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* should be included; three editions of it had been published by 1800, and they contain articles on aesthetics, under various headings. Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* should not be omitted, for it has essays on the "Ancient Minstrels in England," on the "Origin of the English Stage," on the "Metre of *Pierce Plowman's Visions*," and on the "Ancient Metrical Romances." Mention should be made of Cowper's *Task* for its discussions of taste and art in Books I and III. Dodsley's *A Collection of Poems . . . By Several Hands* in its various editions should certainly be mentioned. My copy of the third edition (1751) reprints Bramston's *The Man of Taste*, and has among other things Johnson's prologue "spoken by Mr. Garrick, At the Opening of the Theatre in Drury-lane in 1747"; Whitehead, "The Danger of Writing Verse"; "On Scribbling against Genius"; "The Art of Dancing"; Vansittart, "The Pleasure of Poetry"; Brown, "An Essay upon Satire"; Mason, "Ode to a Water-Nymph" (condemning regularity in landscape gardening). Pearch's *Supplement to Dodsley* should be noted; it has for one thing Dr. John Brown's famous letter describing the Vale of Keswick (edd. 1768, 1770, 1783), as a footnote to Dalton's "Descriptive Poem." Besides this the 1770 edition (4 vols.) has, in Volume I, Dalton, "Some Thoughts on Building and Planting"; Mr. H—, "Ode on Beauty," "Ode to Taste"; in Volume II, Collins, "Ode on the Poetical Character"; Potter, "Holkham, a Poem"; Whitehead, "The Enthusiast"; in Volume III, "Studley-Park"; in Volume IV, the Rev. Mr. H—, "Kimbolton Park"; Langhorne, "Written on a Chinese Temple in Mr. Scott's Garden at Amwell"; Duncombe, "The Feminine: or Female Genius" (criticism of female authors); "Ode to Horror. In the Allegoric, Descriptive, Alliterative, Epithetical, Fantastic, Hyperbolic and Diabolical Style of our Modern Ode-Wrights, and Monody-Mongers." Draper (p. 39) refers to "A

miscellany on taste, 1732, attributed to Theobald," but does not list it. If the bibliography is to include works before and after the exact chronological limits of the century—Professor Wood questions that it should—then I submit, for instance, Jeremy Collier's *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* (1698), and the flurry of protest and reply which it raised, lasting well into the eighteenth century; and the same author's *Essays upon several Moral Subjects: In Two Parts* (3d ed.; London, 1698) (Part II has "Of Musick," "Of the Entertainment of Books," "Of Pleasure"); and Part III of the same work, which appeared in London in 1705 (has "Of Pain," "Of Authors"). Running not as far out of bounds at the latter end of the century as Draper does, I find omitted (to mention two examples) Prince Hoare's *An Inquiry into the Requisite Cultivation and Present State of the Arts of Design in England* (London, 1806) and John Landseer's *Lectures on the Art of Engraving, Delivered at the Royal Institution* . . . (London, 1807).

The "Appendix. Some Recent Comment on Eighteenth Century Aesthetics" contains items published as far back as 1829, and even 1822. If works published during the first half of the nineteenth century are to be included, Nichols' *Anecdotes and Illustrations* should certainly appear. Draper does not attempt completeness in this section; I suggest, however, a few additions of value: Evelyn Cecil, *A History of Gardening in England* (3d ed., enl.; London, 1910) (contains "List of English Printed Books on Gardening Chronologically Arranged down to the Year 1837," which has many titles not given by Draper); F. W. Hilles (ed.), *Letters of Sir Joshua Reynolds* (Cambridge, 1929); S. T. Prideaux, *Aquatint Engraving* . . . (London, 1909); C. E. de Haas, *Nature and the Country in English Poetry of the First Half of the Eighteenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1928); and—important—John H. Pollen (ed.), *The First Proofs of the Universal Catalogue of Books on Art* (2 vols.; London, 1870) (indicates frequently the library where a rare work is to be found).

The last-named work speaks of art as "comprehending Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, Decoration, Coins, Antiquities, &c." This raises the question as to the fields which Professor Draper considers. Should not some works be noted which at least in part treat from an aesthetic point of view the fields of decorations, coins, antiquities, or travels? In the eighteenth century, travelers' accounts, or "tours," were often aesthetic stimuli and guides; for one example, Bingley (see below, *Tour*, p. iii) wrote: "The accounts that I had at different times received of the stupendous and picturesque scenery of some of the counties of North Wales, induced me [to make this tour]. . . . The traveller of taste, who is in search of the grandest scenes that nature has formed. . . ." Should not such a book as the following be listed: John Henniker, *Two Letters on the Origin, Antiquity and History of Norman Tiles stained with Armorial Bearings, to George, Earl of Leicester* (3 pls.; London, 1794)? Something of the problems connected with the making of a bibliography of aesthetics may be appreciated from the fact that Professor Manwaring, in the first sixty pages of her *Italian Landscape in Eighteenth Century England* (New

York, 1925), finds occasion to refer to more than sixty works of which Professor Draper makes no mention; and her book is concerned in a clearly limited way with what is clearly aesthetic.

In alphabetical order by authors (or important words if anonymous), I list these further additions and changes:

R. ADAM. *Ruins of the Palace of the Emperor Diocletian at Spalatro in Dalmatia*. [London,] 1764.

ADDISON. *Poems on Several Occasions: With a Dissertation upon the Roman Poets*. London, 1719.

———. *Works*. 4 vols. London, 1721. [Vol. II has *Remarks on several Parts of Italy, &c. In the Years 1701, 1702, 1703.*]

[ANNA LAETITIA AIKIN.] *Poems*. 4th ed. corr. London, 1774. [Has "The Origin of Song-Writing."]

Annual Register . . . for the Year 1789. London, 1792. [Has "Accounts of Books for 1789" devoted to William Gilpin and Charles Burney—i.e., to picturesque beauty and music; review of Gilpin's *Three Essays, Wye Tour, Tour of the Lakes, Scotch Tour, Forest Scenery*; and of Burney's *General History of Music*.]

The Architecture of Leon Battista Alberti in ten books. Of Painting in three books and Of Statuary in one book. Translated into Italian by Cosimo Bartoli. And now first into English . . . by James Leoni. . . . 3 vols. London, 1726. [Has Ital. and Eng. versions in parallel columns on each page.]

GEORGE BICKHAM. *The Beauties of Stow*. . . . London, 1750.

W. BINGLEY. *A Tour round North Wales . . . containing . . . a Sketch of the History of the Welsh Bards: An Essay on the Language. . . . 2 vols.* London, 1800. [Vol. II reprints two letters from Lyttelton to Bower in 1756, describing North Wales with great sensibility to natural beauty.]

RICHARD BRADLEY. *The Gentleman and Gardener's Kalendar . . . Also The Design of a Green-House . . . for . . . Exotick Plants, by Seignor Galilei of Florence*. 3d ed. London, 1720.

———. *New Improvements of Planting and Gardening. Both Philosophical and Practical. . . . 3d ed. corr.* London, 1719. Part II, 1720. The third and last Part, 1720.

MATTHEW BRETtingham. *The Plans . . . of Holkham in Norfolk . . . and also A Descriptive Account of the Statues, Pictures, and Drawings; not in the former Edition*. London, 1773. [Has addr. to reader and explanation of prints in Ital. as well as in Eng.]

CHARLES CAMERON. *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated . . . and A Dissertation upon the State of the Arts during the Different Periods of the Roman Empire*. London, 1775. [Text in Eng.; but all illus. inscribed in both Fr. and Eng. 1st ed., 1772? A separate volume of plates for it has title-page in Eng., with Fr. trans. alongside: "Baths of the Romans, Publish'd Anno 1772. by Chas. Cameron, Archet."; all plates are inscribed in Eng. and Fr. And in 1772 was published in London a Fr. trans. which does not correspond exactly to the Eng. ed. of 1775.]

COLIN CAMPBELL. *Vitruvius Britannicus, or The British Architect . . . In II Volumes. Vol. I. . . . London, 1715. Another issue of Vol. I, dated 1717. Vol. II, London, 1717.*

- COLEN CAMPBELL. *The Third Volume of Vitruvius Britannicus*. . . . London, 1725. [Title-pages of the last four in Fr. and Eng.]
- ROBERT CASTELL. *The Villas of the Ancients Illustrated*. . . . London, 1728.
- [SIR WILLIAM CHAMBERS.] *Dissertation sur le Jardinage de l'Orient, par Mr. De Chambers ... de l'Anglois, avec plusieurs additions* . . . London, 1772.
- . *A Dissertation on Oriental Gardening. The Second Edition, with Additions. To which is annexed, An Explanatory Discourse*. . . . London, 1773. [Title-page of the annexation reads: "An Explanatory Discourse, by Tan Chet-quā, of Quang-Chew-Fu, Gent. FRSS, MRAAP; also MIAAF, TRA, CGHWM and ATTQ. Wherein the Principles laid down in the Foregoing Dissertation are illustrated and applied to Practice."]
- JAMES CLARKE. *A Survey of the Lakes*. . . . 2d ed. London, 1789. [Attacks the picturesque.]
- [W. COMBE.] *The Justification: A Poem*. . . . London, 1777. [Justification of writing satire; also prose pref. on satire.]
- . *A Poetical Epistle to Sir Joshua Reynolds*. . . . London, 1777. [Intro. on the taste for portraits.]
- [ANON.] *A Companion to the Theatre: or, A View of our most celebrated Dramatic Pieces*. . . . 2 vols. London, 1747.
- [ELIZ. COOPER.] *The Muses Library; Or, A Series of English Poetry*. . . . London, 1741. [Crit. introd. for authors quoted; Vol. II is to have "Some Account of the Progress of Criticism in England."]
- [RICHARD CUMBERLAND.] *The Observer*. . . . Dublin, 1791. [Vol. I, No. 4, against landscape "improvements"; Vol. III, Nos. 81, 82, memoirs of a sentimentalist; No. 84, on natural and acquired taste; Nos. 95, 96, Attalus' country mansion; Nos. 100–106, on the Middle Comedy of the Greeks; Nos. 109, 110, 116, on Jonson, Shakespeare, and Milton; Vol. IV, No. 123, the present taste for acting private plays; No. 133, the various sorts of style; No. 135, on painting; Nos. 137–41, on the New Comedy of the Greeks; Nos. 147–48, on literature past and present; No. 151, the origin and progress of poetry.]
- RICHARD CUMBERLAND. *Odes*. London, 1776. [Has letter to Romney on landscape beauty.]
- The Ancient Buildings of Rome* . . . by Anthony Desgodetz. . . . Translated by the late Mr. G. Marshall. 2 vols. London, 1795. [Orig. Fr. reprinted on left-hand pages.]
- D'HANCARVILLE. *Collection of Etruscan, Greek, and Roman Antiquities from the Cabinet of* . . . W. Hamilton. . . . Naples, 1766. [Eng. and Fr. on opposite pages. This 4-vol. work belongs in a bibliography of aesthetics: see pref., and the text in all vols.] Vol. II, 1767 [has "Preliminary Discourse upon Painting &c."]. Vols. III, IV, 1767 [text, in Fr. only, has "Histoire de la Sculpture, et de la Statuaire des Grecs"].
- A Selection of Old Plays*. London: Printed for R. Dodsley. 10 vols. 1744. [I, pref., on the theater.]
- [JOHN DOWNES.] *Roscius Anglicanus, or An Historical Review of the Stage* . . . London. Printed and Sold . . . 1708. With Additions, By the late Mr. Thomas Davies. . . . London, 1789. [This ed. by F. G. Waldron.]
- JOHN DRYDEN (pub.). *The First Part of Miscellany Poems*. . . . 5th ed. London, 1727. [Has pref. by Dryden on translating ancient poets.]

- THOMAS DUTTON. *The Dramatic Censor; or Weekly Theatrical Report*. . . . Vols. I-II. London, 1800. [Vol. II, No. XVIII, begins weekly criticism of the Exhibition of the Royal Academy; Vol. II, No. XXVI, "Strictures on the Royal Academy."]
- THOMAS FAIRCHILD. *The City Gardener*. . . . London, 1722.
- [SAMUEL] FOOTE. *A Letter . . . to the Reverend Author of the Remarks, critical and christian, on The Minor*. London, 1760. [Defines "enthusiasm" in the arts.]
- . *Taste*. 1st ed., 1752? Reprinted in *A Collection of the most Esteemed Farces*, Vol. I. Edinburgh, 1792.
- [WILLIAM GILPIN.] *A Dialogue upon the Gardens of . . . Viscount Cobham, at Stow*. . . . London, 1748.
- . *An Essay upon Prints*. . . . London, 1768.
- WILLIAM GILPIN. *Observations on the River Wye . . . relative chiefly to Picturesque Beauty*. . . . London, 1782. [Part of the omitted material for each of Gilpin's titles below which begins *Observations, or Remarks*, is "relative chiefly to Picturesque Beauty."]
- . *Observations, on . . . the Mountains and Lakes of Cumberland and Westmoreland*. . . . 2 vols. London, 1786.
- . *Observations . . . on several Parts of Great Britain; particularly the Highlands of Scotland*. 2 vols. London, 1789.
- . *Remarks on Forest Scenery, and other Woodland Views*. . . . 2 vols. London, 1791. [The two items which Draper gives, p. 49, on Gilpin's "Essays . . . 1792," and "Three Essays . . . 1792," refer to one work: *Three Essays: on Picturesque Beauty; on Picturesque Travel; and on Sketching Landscape: to which is added a poem, on Landscape Painting*. London, 1792. The item (Draper, p. 22) "Lady's Mag., XXII, 1791, 486, On picturesque beauty, by William Gilpin," is a reprint of Gilpin's *Forest Scenery*, I, 242-51.]
- . *Observations on the Western Parts of England*. . . . London, 1798.
- RICHARD GRAHAM. *A Short Account of the most Eminent Painters, both Ancient and Modern*. . . . 2d ed. enl. [This is printed as supplementary material on pp. 239-397 of Du Fresnoy, *Art of Painting*, trans. Dryden. 2d ed. enl. London, 1716.]
- [RICHARD GRAVES.] *Euphrosyne: or Amusements on the Road of Life*. . . . London, 1776. [Has introd. "Apology"; poems, "On the Criterion of Taste and Elegance," "On the Poetical Society at Bath-E-n," "The Embargo on Wit," "The Love of Order," etc.] This was issued in a 2d ed. as Vol. I of *Euphrosyne*. . . . In *Two Volumes*, 1780; Vol. II was new (has prose "Essay on the Nature of the Epigram," etc.).
- The Poems of Mr. Gray. To which are added Memoirs of his Life and Writings, by W. Mason*. . . . 4 vols. York, 1778. [Has letters to West, his father, and esp. to Dr. Wharton and Walpole, of aesthetic interest; e.g., those on his Tour to the Lakes, on Strawberry-Hill, architecture.]
- FRANCIS GROSE. *The Antiquities of England and Wales*. 8 vols. new ed. [1783-] 97. [Vol. I has chap. "Architecture."]
- JOSEPH HALFPENNY. *Gothic Ornaments in the Cathedral Church of York*. York, 1795.

- WILLIAM HALFPENNY. *Magnum in Parvo: or, The Marrow of Architecture*. . . . London, 1728.
- [SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON.] *Collection of Engravings from Ancient Vases*. . . . Naples, 1791. [Fr. and Eng. on opposite pages.]
- THOMAS HAYWARD. *The British Muse* . . . to shew the gradual Improvements of our Poetry and Language. With an Historical and Critical Review. . . . 3 vols. London, 1738.
- [CHARLES HEATH.] *Monmouthshire. Descriptive Accounts of Tintern Abbey*. . . . Chepstow, 1799. [Reprints from Grose, Gilpin, Shaw, Whately.]
- [AARON] HILL. *Advice to the Poets*. . . . London, 1731.
- [JOHN HILL.] *Eden: or, A Compleat Body of Gardening* . . . constructing a Garden for Use and Pleasure. . . . London, 1757.
- The Hive. A Collection of the most Celebrated Songs. In Three Volumes*. London, 1726; Vol. II, 3d ed., 1727; III, 1725 (1st ed.?).
- [GEORGE HUDESFORD.] *Warley: A Satire. Addressed to the First Artist in Europe*. . . . London, 1778.
- Ionian Antiquities, Published, with Permission of the Society of Dilettanti, by R. Chandler* . . . , N. Revett . . . , W. Pars. . . . London, 1769.
- Antiquities of Ionia, Published by the Society of Dilettanti. Part the Second*. London, 1797.
- [HUGH KELLY.] *Thespis: A Poem* . . . Critical Examination . . . Drury-Lane Theatre. London, 1766.
- . *Thespis; a Poem. Book the Second* . . . Critical Examination . . . Covent-Garden Theatre. . . . London, 1767.
- WILLIAM KENT. *The Designs of Inigo Jones* . . . for Publick and Private Buildings. . . . 2 vols. [London,] 1727. [Vol. I has additional designs by Lord Burlington and by Kent; Vol. II, by Lord Burlington and by Palladio.]
- [J.B.] DE LA CUNNE DE SAINTE-PALAYE. *Mémoires sur l'ancienne Chevalerie*. . . . 2 vols. Paris, 1759.
- . New ed. enl. 3 vols. Paris, 1781.
- . Eng. trans. by [Mrs. SUSANNA DOBSON]. London, 1784.
- [ANON.] *The Lady's Rhetorick* . . . done from the French. . . . London, 1707.
- B[ATTY] L[ANGLEY]. *The City and Country Builder's and Workman's Treasury of Designs* . . . Ornamental Parts of Architecture. . . . London, 1756.
- BATTY LANGLEY, *Pomona or the Fruit-Garden Illustrated*. . . . London, 1729. [See pref. This continues his *New Principles of Gardening* (1728).]
- . *Practical Geometry Applied to the Useful Arts of Building* . . . Gardening . . . The Various Orders of Architecture . . . the Ways of making Draughts of Buildings, Gardens, Groves, Fountains. . . . London, 1726.
- JOHN LAURENCE. *The Gentleman's Recreation: or the Second Part of the Art of Gardening Improved*. London, 1716.
- L.S.A.I.D.A. [A. J. DEZALLIER D'ARGENVILLE?]. *La Theorie et la pratique du Jardinage* . . . new ed. Paris, 1713 (1st ed., 1709?).
- ALEXANDER LEBLOND. *The Theory and Practice of Gardening*. . . . Trans. John James of Greenwich. 2d ed. enl. London, 1728. [Trans. of the last preceding item.]
- On Gardening. Translated from the French of M. L'Abbé de Lille, sur Les Jardins* . . . London, 1783. [Trans. of the first canto only.]

- GEORGE LORD LYTTTELTON. *Works* Published by Ayscough. 2 vols. Dublin, 1774. [Vol. I, *Persian Letters*; Vol. II, *Dialogues of the Dead* (e.g., Boileau-Pope), and *Account of a Journey into Wales, in Two Letters to Mr. Bowyer*.]
- . 3d ed. with index. 3 vols. London, 1776.
- DAVID MALLET. *Works*. New ed. corr. 3 vols. London, 1759. [Vol. I has "Of Verbal Criticism," a poem.]
- CHARLES MARSHALL. *An Introduction to the Knowledge and Practice of Gardening*. London and Northampton, 1796. [Sec. I, "The Praise of Gardening"; Sec. XI, "Of Rural and Extensive Gardening."]
- [THOMAS J. MATHIAS.] *A Letter to the Author [JOHN MAINWARING] of a Pamphlet, entitled "Remarks on The Pursuits of Literature. . . ."* London, 1798.
- The Microcosm*. . . . Windsor, 1787. [No. IX, "Unity of Design in the Structure of a Poem" (by Frere); No. X, "On Genius" (by J. Smith); No. XVI, "On Language" (Frere); No. XXV, "On Proverbial Expressions" (Frere); No. XXVI, "On Novel-Writing" (Canning); No. XXVII, "On Genius" (J. Smith); No. XXVIII, "On Translation" (R. Smith).]
- [JAMES MILLER.] *Harlequin-Horace: or, The Art of Modern Poetry*. . . . London, 1731.
- JOHN NICHOLS, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes of William Bowyer*. London, 1782.
- OCKENDEN—see WHATELY.
- WILLIAM and JAMES PAIN. *Pain's British Palladio*. . . . new ed. corr. London, 1797.
- JAMES PAINE. *Plans . . . of Noblemen and Gentlemen's Houses . . . Temples and other Garden Buildings . . .*, Vols. I-II. 2d ed. London, 1783. [See pref.]
- ANDREA PALLADIO. *The Four Books of Architecture*. . . . Trans. from orig. Ital. by ISAAC WARE. London, [1738].
- CLAUDE PERRAULT. *A Treatise of the Five Orders in Architecture . . . and of several Abuses*. . . . Trans. from Fr. by JOHN JAMES. 2d ed. enl. London, 1722. [Pref. treats philosophy of beauty in architecture.]
- [AMBROSE PHILIPS.] *A Collection of Old Ballads . . . With Introductions Historical and Critical*. 3 vols. 2d ed. London, 1726. [First ed., 1723? 3d ed., 1727? Vol. II, 2d ed., 1726, has pref. on Chevy-Chase, etc. Vol. III, 2d ed., dated 1738, has pref. on old songs.]
- [JAMES PLUMPTRE.] *The Lakers: A Comic Opera*. . . . London, 1798.
- The Architecture of M. Vitruvius Pollio*. . . . Trans. by W. Newton from orig. Latin. 2 vols. London, 1791. [Contains the ten books of Vitruvius complete.]
- The Prater* (1756), No. XIX, in praise of landscape description and painting, and ornamental needle-work.
- [ANON.] *The Present State of Poetry, a Satire*. . . . London, 1726.
- The Retir'd Gardener*. . . . Translated from the French of the Sieur Louis Liger. . . . Heretofore published in two volumes by George London and Henry Wise. . . . 2d ed. rev. by JOSEPH CARPENTER. London, 1717.
- JONATHAN RICHARDSON. *Works* A New Edition, corrected, with the Additions of An Essay on the Knowledge of Prints, and Cautions to Collectors . . . The Whole intended as a Supplement to the Anecdotes of Printers and Engravers. Lon-

- don, 1792. [Known as *Walpole's Supplement*. The "Additions" are reprints without acknowledgment from Gilpin's *Essay on Prints*.]
- JOSEPH STRUTT. *A Biographical Dictionary . . . of all the Engravers*. 2 vols. London, 1785.
- JAMES STUART and NICHOLAS REVETT. *The Antiquities of Athens . . .*, Vol. I. London, 1762. Vol. II, 1787 (sponsored by Dilettanti Society). Vol. III, 1794, ed. WILLEY REVELEY.
- STEPHEN SWITZER. *The Nobleman, Gentleman, and Gardener's Recreation*. . . . London, 1715.
- CHARLES H. TATHAM. *Etchings, Representing the Best Examples of Ancient Ornamental Architecture; Drawn from the Originals in Rome*. . . . London, 1799.
- The Universal Spectator* [orig. conducted by Henry Baker and Defoe, 1728-33?], Vols. I-II. London, 1786. [Vol. I: "Classics, their excellence set forth," p. 220; On conversation, pp. 80, 226, 241; the fashion of words, p. 55; on criticism, p. 65; On the ancients, p. 222; On a course of reading, p. 251; Vol. II: On the use of biography, p. 169; On books of piety and romances, p. 131; On the want of taste, p. 274; "A New Session of the Poets, For the Year 1730," p. 43.]
- [JOHN BOWLES.] *Versailles Illustrated . . . Statues, Groups of Figures, Water Falls, Pleasure Houses, &c.* . . . London, 1726.
- [FRANCIS G.] WALDRON, DIBDIN, &c. *A Compendious History of the English Stage . . . criticism on the merits of Theatrical Performers*. . . . London, 1800.
- HORACE WALPOLE. *Anecdotes of Painting*. . . . 4th ed. enl. 2 vols. London, 1786.
- . *A Catalogue of Engravers*. . . . 2d ed. London, 1786.
- [JOHN WATKINS.] *The Peeper*. . . . London, 1796. [No. XV, "On the Prostitution of Literature, and the Arts to the Purposes of Vice"; No. XXVII, "On the Corruption of the English Language by the Introduction of Foreign Words and Phrases."]
- [RICHARD WESTON.] *Tracts on Practical Agriculture and Gardening*. . . . To which is added, *A Complete Chronological Catalogue of English Authors on . . . Gardening*. . . . London, 1769. [Valuable catalogue of 70 pp.; also has "Remarks on some of the Antient Writers."]
- [T. WHATELY.] *Observations on Modern Gardening*. . . . To which are added, I: *An Essay on Design in Gardening*; II: *Letters describing the Lake of Killarney, and Mucruss Gardens*. By William Ockenden. . . . Dublin, 1770.
- [———.] *L'Art de Former les Jardins Modernes . . . A quoi le Traducteur a ajouté un Discourse . . . sur l'origin de l'art, des Notes sur le texte, & une Description détaillée des Jardins de Stowe* . . . , Paris, 1771.
- [ROBERT WOOD.] *The Ruins of Palmyra*. . . . London, 1753.
- . *The Ruins of Balbec*. . . . London, 1757.
- [JOHN WOOLFE and [JAMES] GANDON.] *Vitruvius Britannicus, or The British Architect* . . . , Vol. IV . . . London, 1767. [Supplement to Campbell's *Vitruvius*; title-page and introd. in Fr. and Eng.] Vol. V, 1771.

WILLIAM D. TEMPLEMAN

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *THE QUIDNUNCKI'S*

Early in 1724 there appeared in London, in the form of a single folio sheet, *A Poem address'd to the Quidnunc's, at St. James's Coffee-House London. Occasion'd by the Death of the Duke of Orleans*. It was reprinted in the "last" volume of the Swift and Pope *Miscellanies* (published by Motte) in 1727, under the title *The Quidnunki's: A Tale Occasion'd by the Death of the Duke Regent of France*. The lines reproduced below are from the 1727 text.

This poem, which is forty-eight lines long, is listed by W. Spencer Jackson among the "Doubtful and Supposititious Works" of Swift.¹ It was reprinted by Sir Walter Scott, without comment, among the "Miscellanies in Verse, By Mr. Pope, Dr. Arbuthnot, Mr. Gay, &c." (that is, not by Swift himself) in his edition of Swift's *Works*. It has been reproduced in many editions of the poems of Gay, including those of Bell (1773), Nichols (1779), Jeffery (1795), Cooke (1804), Park (1808), and Underhill (1893). To the late F. Elrington Ball it seemed "impossible for any student of Swift's verse to doubt that 'Newgate's Garland' and the 'Quidnunkie's' were written by him and not by Gay. The former is redolent of the atmosphere of the deanery at the period, and the latter foreshadows 'Gulliver's Travels.'"² Later Dr. Bell was even more definite:

Besides the foregoing pieces Swift wrote also probably early in 1724 with the help of [Charles] Ford a piece entitled *The Quidnunkis*, which has been hitherto attributed to Gay. There are lines in it that surely could have come into the brain of none but the author of *Gulliver*:

All at a Stand? You see great Changes?
Ah, Sir! you never saw the Ganges.
There dwell the Nations of Quidnunki's,
(So Monomotapa calls Monkies:)
On either Bank, from Bough to Bough,
They meet and chat (as we may now.)
Whispers go round, they grin, they shrug,
They bow, they snarl, they scratch, they hug;
And, just as Chance, or Whim provoke them,
They either bite their Friends, or stroke them.³

To G. C. Faber, critical editor of *The Poetical Works of John Gay*,⁴ the matter is less clear: "The piece strikes me as imitative rather than original—as, indeed, very much the sort of thing that Gay might have written under Swift's powerful influence. But I am content to put it with the doubtfuls."

Since little of Arbuthnot's verse has been preserved, no attempt has ever been made to attribute the poem to him. Yet precisely this solution is indicated by the following selections from letters of Dr. William Stratford, canon of Christ Church, Oxford, to Lord Edward Harley (within a few weeks to become second Earl of Oxford) at London:

1723-4, FEBRUARY 4: The verses are very good, and, as your Lordship truly observes, have a true taste of human life. May one enquire who is the author? He

¹ Swift, *Works*, ed. Temple Scott, XII, 213.

² *Notes and Queries*, 12th ser., XII (1923), 174.

³ *Swift's Verse* (1929), p. 199. The quoted lines are 15-24. ⁴ Oxford, 1926, p. xxvii.

need not be ashamed of them. Who is Tr——? I know of no Trevor that now belongs to the Court, and yet that is the only name I can think of at present that rhymes to endeavour.

1723-4, FEBRUARY 10: I did not think Arbuthnot had had a genius for such performances. Your Lordship is much in the right, that he has no reason to be ashamed of it. Pope has the credit of it here, and has no reason to be displeased that another's child is laid to him. It does him as much credit as any of his own.⁵

It is odd that later editorial opinion should balance Swift and Gay, whereas contemporary guessing, at any rate in Oxford, was in favor of Pope. Harley's reply to Stratford's inquiry of February 4 is not available; but that it afforded the ground for the remark in the second letter is beyond question.

This evidence is happily supported by the poem itself.

How vain are Mortal Man's Endeavours!
(Said, at Dame Elliot's, Master Tr——a)
Good Orleans dead! in Truth 'tis hard:
Oh! may all Statesmen die prepar'd!

So it begins. Orleans had died on December 2, 1723. The speaker, filled with apprehension, sees great dangers threatening England from the Continent. But an India-merchant interrupts with the lines quoted by Dr. Ball, pictures the disastrous splash of a too venturesome monkey as his lofty twig snaps, describes the "gen'ral Screech" of the tribe, and concludes thus:

Each trembles for the publick Weal,
And, for a while, forgets to steal.
A while, all Eyes intent and steddly,
Pursue him, whirling down the Eddy.
But out of Mind when out of View,
Some other mounts the Twig anew;
And Business, on each Monkey Shore,
Runs the same Track it went before.

The metrical form is perhaps well chosen for the purpose. But the first dozen lines are singularly infelicitous: they are rough, labored, and difficult to apprehend; there are half-line "fillers" (e.g., "Man in being," and "strange Work"); indeed, notwithstanding the good opinion of Stratford, little can be said for the poem until the speech of the India-merchant is under way. From that point the author seems to have found himself and to have managed the form with moderate skill. None the less it lacks the craftsmanship which should characterize the work of Pope or Gay in 1724. Arbuthnot was a prose writer, with more sense for force than for rhythm. The short line of the poem, the low, quick flight of phrase—more like Swift's than Pope's—are in accord with his economical prose style.

In substance, also, *The Quidnunci's* resembles Arbuthnot's characteristic sentiment. His conviction that "a comet will make much more strange revolu-

⁵ *Portland MSS* ("Hist. MSS. Com. Reports"), VII, 373.

tions upon the face of our globe than all the petty changes that can be occasioned by governments and ministries"⁶ expressed in a figure the attitude of the calm observer of the long stream of time. Arbuthnot had seen a great deal of the bough-to-bough performances of statesmen, with the inevitable fall when the twig cracked. He could not regard very seriously any one splash in the whirling eddy. The sobering of the public who momentarily "forget to steal" recalls his theory of man's incorrigible baseness,⁷ blind selfishness here submerged by fright for only the briefest interval of clear thought. The concluding lines of the poem, however, describe the quick restoration of steady, unruffled conditions, dependable if imperfect. They express whimsically the philosophy of normal change needed to reassure an unstable public mind, typified by the perturbed questioner of the coffee-house. Arbuthnot's enthusiasm for science, with its accompanying hope for the morrow, accounts for this and many another note of reconciliation in his works and his letters. Herein, despite their likeness in ways more easily perceived, he differed markedly from Swift.

This poem, with the *Essay on the Origin of Sciences* (in which Arbuthnot but not Swift had a share), should renew the caution of those inclined to attribute to Swift all doubtful items which use beast materials, or which otherwise suggest *Gulliver's Travels*.

The poem occasioned two caricatures in Jonathan Smedley's *Gulliveriana* (1728), which ridiculed Pope and Swift for the *Miscellanies*. The first of these, *A Letter from the Quidnunc's at St. James's Coffee-house and the Mall, London, to their Brethren at Lucas's Coffee-house, in Dublin*,⁸ is addressed "To Mr. Smith, Inquisitor-General, and President of the Arched-Seat, and the Athenian Corner, at Lucas's Coffee-house." The Quidnuncs want news; they are not disturbed by "great changes," but by an exasperating quiet:

Good Lord! what silent Times are these!
All's Peace at Home! Abroad all's Peace!

It was "not so when pious Anna reigned." The poem as it continues is not closely imitative.

The second one, however—*An Indian Tale: Occasion'd by the Verses, on the Quidnunchi's: Miscellanies, Vol. 3. p. 229. apply'd to the joint Authors of that Volume*—is a strict parody. It shows a clever and merciless use of the machinery of Arbuthnot's poem for an attack on his two friends. Who would be witty or great, asks the writer, now that Sw—t and P—pe have failed in their "weak alliance"? Then follows the tale of a baboon and a marmoset who have agreed to climb the tree of fame by turns to secure the golden fruit.

⁶ Letter to Swift, August 6, 1715 (*Correspondence of Swift*, ed. Ball, II, 296).

⁷ Letter to Swift, August 12, 1714 (*ibid.*, p. 232).

⁸ Ball, in arguing that Swift wrote *The Quidnunchi's*, found in this *Letter* an indication of "an Irish origin for the notice taken of those London newsmongers." But a presumed Irish origin for the first poem is the most that can be inferred; certainly that phrase describes Smedley's motive in using the *Letter*.

Balked, they combine their cunning, and laugh sneeringly at the general "Tribe of Monkey-Race" from whom the fruit is concealed.

Thus Puff'd, together, up they Bounce;
But Break the Branch, and down they Flounce
Into the Deep and Rapid Stream:
They Kick; Embrace, and Scratch and Scream:
Thrice to the Surface, from the Ground,
Clasp'd Arm in Arm, th' Adventurers bound;
But sink, for ever sink, into the Vast PROFUND.

Arbuthnot was ignored in *Gulliveriana*. It may seem strange that a man who was afterward (in the *Miscellaneous Works of the Late Dr. Arbuthnot* [1750]) loaded with responsibility for an array of things which he did not write should have been neglected by his contemporaries when they dealt with something which he did write. But his indifference to his reputation as a man of letters is well known. He wrote for exercise, and abandoned all thought of yesterday as he eagerly picked up a fresh hint. And knowledge that *The Quidnunci's* was from his pen could only have emphasized, as it now does, his limited talent for verse.

LESTER M. BEATTIE

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

AN ESSAY BY GOLDSMITH IN THE *LADY'S MAGAZINE*

In the appendix to *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith*, Mr. Crane suggests that a short sketch entitled "A Lady of Fashion in the Times of ANNA BULLEN compared with one of modern Times" in the *Lady's Magazine* for October, 1760 (II, 124-26), may be by Goldsmith. His reasons are (1) that the essay appeared in a periodical which Goldsmith was then probably editing¹ and (2) that the concluding paragraphs, which seem to him quite in Goldsmith's manner, find fairly close parallels in the *Bee* and *The Deserted Village*.² Mr. Crane's arguments may be reinforced by the following close verbal parallels between the central part of the essay and a paragraph describing a lady of fashion of a somewhat earlier period in the second part of Goldsmith's "A Reverie at the Boar's Head Tavern in Eastcheap," published seven months earlier in the *British Magazine* for March, 1760:

"A LADY OF FASHION"³

The country madam on the other hand was plain in her dress, sincere in her manners, and was always proud of say-

"A REVERIE"⁴

But perhaps you are desirous of knowing what were the peculiar qualifications of women of fashion at that

¹ See *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith*, collected and edited by Ronald S. Crane (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927), pp. xxxii and 128.

² *Ibid.*, p. 131.

³ *Lady's Magazine*, II, 124-25. The italics are mine.

⁴ I give the text of the *British Magazine*, I, 153. The italics are mine. The passage is in *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. J. W. M. Gibbs (London, 1885-86), I, 284-85.

ing what she thought without fear. *She could neither read nor write*, tea was never heard of, and yet she contrived even so to pass the twenty-four hours tolerably enough.

She was up early, saw breakfast served in the great hall by six o'clock, which in those days was one of the most hearty meals of the family. During this time both master, mistress, and servants, who all feasted in the same room, entertained each other with the dreams of the night, with stories of witches, spirits, and giants. From thence the gentlemen repaired to the cellar, where every one drank as he thought proper, till either business or rural sports called them abroad. In the mean time the lady of the house examined the state of her larders, poultry, and dairy; and the young ladies applied to their ordinary occupations, of making their own and the families cloathing of all sorts; even down to the stockings; for at that time knitting and weaving them were arts unknown. Thus employed they received visits from their sweet-hearts, who not having much to say generally made love by romping, by interrupting the damsels in their work as often as they refused a kiss. And this with all the history of bear-baiting, their greyhounds, and their feats in arms, made up the whole mystery of honourable love.

Twelve was the latest hour of dining every where. At this time the dining-room was strewed with fresh rushes for the reception of the company. Dinner was but a short repast, as supper was the profuse entertainment at six o'clock, and the intervals between spent in field diversions by the men, shooting with arrows at butts, running at the ring, &c. to which the ladies always accompanied them. From supper to bed time, those that liked it caroused, sung songs, and told stories, and were as merry as much simplicity and ignorance would permit:

period; and in a description of the present landlady, you will have a tolerable idea of all the rest. Mrs. Gleek was the daughter of a nobleman, and received such an education in the country as became her quality, beauty, and great expectations. She could make shifts and hose for herself and all the servants of the family, when she was twelve years old. *She knew the names of the four and twenty letters, so that it was impossible to bewitch her; and this was a greater piece of learning, than any lady in the whole country could pretend to.* Some were even pleased to ridicule her as a female pedant upon this account: it is true, she was not a little vain of this qualification. *She was always up early; and saw breakfast served in the great hall by six o'clock.* At this scene of festivity she generally improved good humour, by telling her dreams, relating stories of spirits, several of which she herself had seen; and one of which she was reported to have killed with a black-hafted knife. From hence she usually went to make pastry in the larder, and here she was followed by her sweethearts, who were much helped on in conversation by struggling with her for kisses. About ten, miss generally went to play hot-cockles and blindman's buff, in the parlour; and when the young folks (for they seldom played at these diversions when grown old) were tired of such amusements, the gentlemen entertained miss with the history of their greyhounds, bear-baitings, and victories at cudgel-playing. If the weather was fine they ran at the ring, shot at butts, while miss held in her hand a ribbon, with which she adorned the conqueror. *She was not taught to breakfast upon tea and such slops; but could dispatch a toast and tankard at a meal.*

the younger part *went to hot cockles, blindman's buff*, or any thing that furnished an opportunity for romping; and the graver sort to Gleek Primero,⁵ and other sedentary games, of which we know scarce more than the names.

These parallels might suggest that someone else was borrowing from Goldsmith's earlier writing, but such a hypothesis is highly improbable inasmuch as Goldsmith himself was probably the editor of the periodical in which the essay appeared. The parallels, then, taken with those pointed out by Mr. Crane from other works both earlier and later than the essay, seem to show quite certainly that Goldsmith was here merely following his common practice of borrowing from himself.

ARTHUR FRIEDMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

⁵ Goldsmith mentions Primero as the popular gambling game in the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII in the third part of "A Reverie" (*British Magazine*, I [April, 1760], 205; see *Works*, I, 289). Cf. also *The Life of Richard Nash, Esq.* (1762), in *Works*, IV, 79: "The games of Gleek, Primero, In-and-In, and several others now exploded, employed our sharpening ancestors. . . ."

BOOK REVIEWS

Gliglois. A French Arthurian Romance of the Thirteenth Century. By CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. 177.

Among recent Arthurian books, this edition deserves special notice. As a medieval manuscript *Gliglois* no longer exists, having been destroyed by the fire of Turin in 1904. But the Widener Library has the late Wendelin Foerster's papers on the MS, including several "copies"; and it is thanks to these that Professor Livingston has given us his excellent edition, preceded by a thoroughgoing Introduction and followed by Notes, a Table of Proper Names, and a Glossary (of the selected type, in which French, not English, equivalents are given for the Old French).

Outwardly the romance, composed in the first quarter of the thirteenth century (p. 56), has the appearance of a *roman d'aventure*. Although the names and, as I think, the motifs of the story are Arthurian, the absence of the so-called Celtic magic and the predominance of the "love-service" lift the work out of the strictly Arthurian class. Comparing it to the works of Chrétien, Livingston observes the advance made by the author toward more "modern" psychology and greater "verity and naturalness" in the treatment of the heroine, Beauté. He detects certain similarities to *Erec*, *Cligés*, and *Perceval* (in addition to closer parallels to *Amadas et Ydoine*), but these are all reminiscential rather than direct sources. To this category one is tempted to add the *Charette* (*Lancelot*), especially for vss. 1245-1403, where *Gliglois* "serves" his disdainful mistress until his feet bleed, while she pays no attention to his suffering but jests with the knight who feeds the falcon. Since the plot of *Gliglois* includes the possession of the prize of valor (in this case, a falcon), it might have been profitable to consider the whole group of stories (in which *Erec* and *Bel Inconnu* also figure) where a "sparrow-hawk" is the hero's reward.¹ On the other hand, Livingston ably discusses the general theme of the Squire of Low Degree and the view, first suggested by Gaston Paris and supported by W. H. Schofield,² that *Gliglois* belongs to the *Bel Inconnu* cycle. Cautiously he concludes (p. 29) by saying: "The resemblance here [with *Amadas et Ydoine*] appears much closer than that between *Gliglois* and the romances of the *Bel Inconnu* cycle upon which Professor Schofield insists. Let us be satisfied with having pointed out [the resemblance], and form no conclusions. We cannot be sure." That is not exactly the issue. In

¹ See *Med. Phil.*, XI (1914), 450, n. 1, and the fact that Andreas Capellanus knew the story in that form.

² It should, however, be noted that Paris later gave up his theory about the connection with the *Bel Inconnu*, and that Schofield had never read the romance itself.

literary history "conclusions" in a strictly scientific sense are seldom attained, and when conclusions are not possible, hypotheses, which should be, of course, well grounded, must take their place. To be sure, the remark is made (p. 24): "the author's invention consists in the arrangement of commonplaces and motifs which were in the air, and in the new combination of widely separated details which produced the effect of originality." Yet this does not preclude the existence of a basic story-type; and in the present case I should say off-hand that the connection with the *Bel Inconnu* cycle appears worthy of further investigation—on the following grounds:

1. *Gliglois*, as an Arthurian name, is close to Germ. *Wigalois*, in name and character the same person as *Giglain* (*Guinglain*), hero of *Le Bel Inconnu*. One has only to think of the various "deformations," if you will, of the name *Perceval le gal(l)ois* in Old French.

2. In vs. 1922, the damsel, who has been informed privately about the youth, accosts him sweetly:

Par son droit nom l'apelle et nomme.

Compare vs. 7:

Par droit non Glygloiz le nommerent.

On the way to the tournament he is nevertheless told to keep his name secret (vs. 2052). Yet, among Arthurian knights, his name and person are well known from the very beginning of the romance. Query: Did not the source of the story, if a source existed, conceal the name at the beginning? In answering this question, the evidence of other similar stories (e.g., *Perceval*, *Lancelot*, *Bel Inconnu*), where secrecy is an essential motif, is pertinent.

3. That the hero was brought up in a "forest," with all that this implies, is common, as a motif, to the *Perceval* and the *Bel Inconnu* cycle. Compare *Gliglois*, vs. 12:

Molt sot de chienz et molt d'oysiax,
De cascun sot bien le maniere,
Si soit de boiz et de riviere.³

4. Everyone admits that the general plot, barring specific incidents and the supernatural, is that of the Squire-of-Low-Degree; compare the cycle.

5. The tournament-scene, which Livingston himself thinks (p. 32) "is here limited to a single day," although it should be noted that there are two distinct tournaments, in some respects resembles the widespread Three Days' Tournament—on which the following references may be added to Livingston's: Cross and Nitze, *Lancelot and Guenevere* (Chicago, 1930), pp. 17 and 77; Ronald S. Crane, "An Irish Analogue of the Legend of Robert the Devil," *Rom. Rev.*, V (1914), 55-67.⁴

Hence I believe that Schofield's hypothesis is still usable, namely, that *Gliglois* is "connected with the cycle of poems with which every one felt it ought to be connected." The story may still be explained as a rationalized form of the same, to which, of course, other "literary" motifs were assimilated.

³ This word is lacking in the Glossary.

⁴ See also Dorothy E. Winters, *The Three Days' Combat*, unpublished Chicago dissertation, 1931.

As for the language of the poet, distinguished by Livingston from that of "the body of the poem" (I presume what is meant is the "language of the scribe"), it shows Picard traits mingled with good central French forms. Declension of nouns and adjectives is still intact, and the versification would seem to place the work "next" to the *Bible* of Berzé (read Berzé, p. 48) and a little after *Amadas* and *Bel Inconnu*.

On the text proper, edited with great skill, the following minor queries⁶ may be raised. In putting an accent on *-éz* the editor follows the rules of the committee of the Société des anciens textes français (*Rom.*, LII [1926], 243 ff.), strange as the accent may look. But why not write one on *les* [Lat. *latus*], especially in such a line as (vs. 2033) *Li provos les luy chevauchoit* [the word is not in the Glossary]; so, too, I should accent *pres* (2156) and *ques* (2209), since we have *niés* (2255) and *gué* (2414) in the text. Is not *L'a escript* preferable to *La escript* (1442)? *A un conseil* (1757) I should interpret "to a secret place"; the Glossary does not explain. *Mais le tace de vo mantel* (1928) may be *tacé* (i.e., *tasel*) *de vo mantel*; cf. the variant given to *mantel de gris* (55), i.e., *mante de gris*, and *Chev. as deus espées*, ed. Foerster, vss. 239-40:

De uous fera faire au mantel
De uostre barbe le tassel.

Is not *Il quant* (2094) originally *Li quant*? The expression *ce est del mains* (2102) is not explained; see Foerster, *Wörterbuch*, page 173. Isn't *Sont iluec le tournoiment* (2130) better read as *S'ont iluec le tournoiment*? Verse 2229: comma is lacking at the end. Again, in vs. 2712 for *Les soi* I prefer *Lés soi*. *Carduel*, vs. 2896 (also vs. 42), is explained as a "town in Wales"; Zimmer, *Zeit. franz. Spr. u. Lit.*, XII (1890), 237, identified it with Carlisle. It is interesting to note that *Amors* (2906) and *amours* (2921: *sens d'amours*) are apparently distinct from the *fine amour* (or *amor*) of vss. 2915 and 2919. On the whole, a well-edited text for which all students of the Middle Ages will be extremely grateful.

W. A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Dance of Death. By FLORENCE WARREN. ("Early English Text Society," Original Series, No. 181, Issue for 1929.) London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1931. Pp. xxxi+118. 1 plate.

The Physician of the Dance of Death. By ALDRED SCOTT WARTHIN. New York: Paul B. Hoeber, 1931. Pp. xvi+142. 1 plate, 91 figures. Reprinted with additions and corrections from *Annals of Medical History*, N.S., II (1930); III (1931).

The active interest in the Dance of Death makes very welcome all additions to our information. Recently Florence Warren has printed, in parallel,

⁶ A number of these were suggested by Professor T. A. Jenkins.

Lydgate's *Dance of Death* from the Ellesmere MS 26/A.13 and B. M. Lansdowne 699 with variants from other manuscripts and the printed edition. Unfortunately the volume, posthumously issued by Beatrice White, lacks the editor's final touch. Since we learn from the Preface that the editor visited Germany in pursuit of her studies, we may suppose that the abundant and fundamental German literature on the theme would have been canvassed. Here reference to Wolfgang Stammer's brief article, "Totentänze" (*Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*, III [Berlin, 1928-29], 381-83) is a sufficient indication of the bibliographical approach. Since he surveys the problem of the Dance of Death in an earlier, comprehensive essay, *Die Totentänze des Mittelalters* ("Einzelschriften zur Bücher- und Handschriftenkunde," IV [Munich, 1922]), I need only suggest briefly how to pursue farther the questions raised by the introduction and name in connection with each question fundamental studies which provide a basis for investigation. Three main themes, it is generally conceded, unite in the Dance of Death (Warren, p. xii): the notion of death as the great leveler (see W. Rehm, *Der Todesgedanke in der deutschen Dichtung vom Mittelalter bis zur Romantik* ("Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte: Buchreihe," XIV [Halle a. S., 1928]), E. Döring-Hirsch, *Tod und Jenseits im Spätmittelalter* ("Studien zur Geschichte der Wirtschaft und Geisteskultur," II [Berlin, 1927]), and Jan Van der Heyden, *Het Thema en de Uitbeelding van den Dood in de Poëzie der late Middeleeuwen en der vroege Renaissance in de Nederlanden* ("Werken" of the K. Vlaamsche Akademie [Ghent], Reeks 6, Vol. XLVII [Ghent, 1930]) and its conspicuous expression in the "Vado mori" poems, which are in some way related to the Dance of Death (see W. F. Storck, "Das Vado mori," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, XLII [1910], 422-28; additions in Stammer, *Totentänze des Mittelalters*, p. 53); the contrast of the living and the dead exemplified in the legend of "Les trois Vifs et les trois Mors" (see K. Künstle, *Die Legende der drei Lebenden und der drei Toten und der Totentanz* [Freiburg i. Br., 1908]; W. F. Storck, *Die Legende von den drei Lebenden und von den drei Toten* [Heidelberg, 1910]); and the tales of dancing and the dancing dead (see A. Stieren, *Ursprung und Entwicklung der Tänzersage* [Münster, 1911; Stammer, *Totentänze des Mittelalters*, pp. 48 ff.). The Introduction raises a number of interesting minor questions. Although the origin of the name "La dance macabre" has been long discussed, it still remains obscure. Miss Warren neglects an occurrence earlier than any she cites: Jean Lefevre used it not long after 1376 (see Wackernagel, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, IX [1853], 315; Stammer, *Totentänze des Mittelalters*, p. 16); and she might have mentioned Kupka's theory (*Zur Genesis der mittelalterlichen Totentänze* [Stendal, 1908]). The name is occasionally used for the Wild Hunt (see Warren, p. 99), but this employment seems to be rare and I have noted it only in Blois. Probably we need seek no relation between the *Schwarzer Mann* of a German children's game (Warren, pp. xix-xx) and the Dance of Death (see Lewalter and Schläger, *Deutsches*

Kinderlied und Kinderspiel [Kassel, 1911], p. 405, No. 978, and particularly Singer, *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, XIII [1903], 60). Although this notion must be given up, there is an interesting and unexamined problem in the survival of the Dance of Death in folksong; see, e.g., Bolte, *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, XXVI (1916) 181, n. 1; A. Hauffen, *Die deutsche Sprachinsel Gottschee* ("Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte, Literatur und Sprache Oesterreichs," III [Graz, 1895]), p. 402, No. 41. Miss Warren failed to note the proverbs in her texts or at least failed to comment on them. Lydgate follows his French source in the trick of closing almost every octet with a proverb. The origin, nature, and influence of this literary device, on which T. A. Jenkins comments (*Modern Language Notes*, XXIII [1908], 167-69), are imperfectly understood. Parallels to the proverbs used by Lydgate are occasionally difficult to find and the proverbs are, moreover, very incompletely registered by Duschl (*Das Sprichwort bei Lydgate*, Weiden, 1912). The proverb which has particularly interested me occurs in "Preste ('loan') and dette mote be zolde a-žeyne" (p. 19, l. 119; "Notes," p. 114). This line, which is corrupted by later copyists, is better understood in the light of the following proverbs to which Professor Richard Jente calls my attention: "Alle Schulden muss man bezahlen" (Wander, *Deutsches Sprichwörterlexikon*, IV, 364, "Schuld," 1), which derives ultimately from the old lawbook, the *Sachsenspiegel* (ed. Homeyer, Berlin, 1827, I, 64); and "Wer borget, der muss zahlen" (Wander, *op. cit.*, I, 432, "borgen," 34). English parallels are not quite so close: "Borowyd þing wil home agayn" ("The Wise Man's Proverbs," *Englische Studien*, XXIII [1897], 442; Zupitza, "Proverbis of Wysdom," *Archiv*, XC [1893], 251, l. 32; Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* [London, 1929], p. 61, "Borrowed," 3) and "He that dies pays all debts" (Jente, "The Proverbs of Shakespere," *Washington University Studies*, XIII [1926], 391-444, No. 93), which I mention only because of its appropriateness to the theme. Clearly Lydgate, and before him, the French author, had in mind an old legal proverb.

Warthin's interesting and beautifully printed essay in iconography cannot be treated here with the fulness it deserves. As a study of a single figure in the Dance of Death, it has special merits of completeness and detail. The author, who is neither philologist nor iconographer, has devoted the odd hours of a lifetime to this study and we look with pleasure and satisfaction on the results. He gives something more than a technical iconographic investigation. His discussion is presented with an ample background. He suggests the problem of the iconography of the figure of Death (see in addition to his remarks the suggestions in Stämmeler, *Totentänze des Mittelalters*, p. 57, n. 42, and Frimmel, "Beiträge zu einer Ikonographie des Todes," *Mittheilungen der k.k. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale*, X-XIII, as cited by Fehse, *Der Ursprung der Totentänze* [Halle a. S., 1907], p. 9, n. 2). The latest contribution to the subject that I have noticed is the interesting essay by Paul Diepgen, "Eine volkstümliche Darstellung des Todes vom

Oberrhein" (*Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, XL [1930], 189-92). The bibliography of the Dance of Death (Warthin, pp. 128-36) is useful and commendable. I add the helpful dissertation of J. Dollriess, *Totentanztexte seit dem 16. Jahrhundert* (Königsberg i. Pr., 1927), and E. Breede, *Studien zu den lateinischen und deutsch-sprachlichen Totentanztexten des 13. bis 17. Jahrhunderts* (Halle a. S., 1931), which last I have noticed above (*Modern Philology*, XXIX [1932], 505-6). The problems in the study of the Dance of Death are not settled and these contributions are valuable aids to their solution. I shall not leave the subject without pointing out that the problems are not limited to the origin, dissemination, form, and iconography. Themes belonging to the Dance of Death persist in other literary genres, and these survivals, like the folksongs I have mentioned above, call for investigation; see e.g., G. Graber, *Der Kärntner Totentanz; Komödie von dem grimmigen Tod* ("Deutsche Hausbücherei," No. 129, Vienna, 1924) with an appendix, "Lieder vom Tod und den letzten Dingen."

ARCHER TAYLOR

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Die Anfänge des Puritanismus. Versuch einer Deutung der englischen Reformation. By HERBERT SCHÖFFLER. ("Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten," Vierzehnter Band.) Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1932. Pp. 177.

La Réforme en Angleterre. I, Le Schisme Anglican, Henri VIII (1509-1547). By G. CONSTANT. Paris: Perrin et Cie., 1930. Pp. vi+777.

In 1500 the intellectual and religious life of England was apparently a unity. In 1600 only a minority remained true to the old faith, and among the secessionists themselves there were unmistakable signs of another schism. Historians, like the philosophers of old, are confronted with the problem of how the many arose from the one. Professor Constant in his volume deals mainly with the earlier of the two sixteenth-century English schisms. He is concerned with the fact that at the time of the so-called divorce "pour des millions et des millions d'humains, pendant des siècles, allait être coupée la source catholique de la vie," and he undertakes to trace the process by which this was accomplished. Beginning with the late medieval attacks on the church which centered around the person of Wycliffe he comes quickly to the reign of Henry VIII, and there indicates carefully the course of the Reformation. As might be expected in one of his faith who is also the author of a work on the ecclesiastical diplomacy of the time, he explains in some detail the Catholic opposition to the Reformation, and the influence of diplomatic negotiations, including those with the German princes, upon the course of events in England. The research has been very carefully done, and the documentation is more than adequate. In fact, the notes, which contain many useful references, occupy much more than half the book. Nevertheless it is

surprising to see how little the point of view differs from the standard one of Pollard. There is a slight tendency to minimize or pass over such flaws in the conduct of the representatives of the old church as the papal suggestion of royal bigamy as a solution of the divorce problem, but on the other hand many are squarely faced.

As the double title of Professor Schöffler's work indicates, he is interested in both of the sixteenth-century English schisms, but it is the second with which he is especially concerned. Students of English literature have for a long time been discussing the relations of Puritanism to their subject, and it is not surprising that the editor of the *Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten* should contribute a volume on this theme to his own series. Nevertheless there is in this volume surprisingly little concerning literature or even about Puritanism as an intellectual system. It is of Puritanism as Dissent that the author mainly treats. "Ein Grundunterschied der englischen von fast aller festländischen Entwicklung ist es, dass ein Dissent da ist, dass zu allem und jedwedem Ding die Stimme einer grundsätzlichen Opposition, einer konstanten, weltanschauungsentschiedenen Minderheit laut wird, die ihr Eigenrecht verlangt." This volume is, therefore, to be considered as a background study, justified by the theory, which the author expresses in the introduction to his *Protestantismus und Literatur* (Leipzig, 1922), that the ideas of Weber and Troeltsch on the social and religious development of the English must be mastered and applied in order properly to understand their literature. While mention is made of research in English libraries there are only occasional footnotes, and the value of the work is stated in the Preface to consist, not in the particular facts produced, but "im Ideengang, den die Tatsachen begründen wollen." Beginning therefore with some rather disjointed remarks on certain medieval heretics, the author also comes to Wycliffe and thus to the reign of Henry VIII, which he treats at some length. However, he continues the story with chapters devoted to the reigns of each of the three succeeding Tudor sovereigns, and is thus enabled to follow the Puritan schism until it is clearly evident, if not fully developed.

Both books deal with the difficult subject of the causation of the events they record, though Schöffler's work is more directly devoted to this problem, the importance of which he rightly states to be in direct proportion to the difficulty of its solution. Both writers agree in making personal and political, rather than religious, considerations the chief cause of the original break with Rome. It is granted that there were in England before the divorce some survivals of Lollardy, and some traces of the rising tide of Lutheranism, but they were not of sufficient strength by themselves to have effected the changes of the third decade of the century.

Indications of the developing schism in the ranks of the anti-Roman faction were to be seen in the reign of Henry VIII, and Constant devotes chapters to the advanced and moderate parties, in which he seems to suggest that the divergence is to be accounted for by the differences in the personalities of their

leaders. Cromwell and Cranmer, the leaders of the advanced party, were married men with many German contacts, while the rival party was led by men like Gardiner, Stokesley, Bonner, and Tunstall who were more conservative in their views. Schöffler's theory is much more elaborate. He takes up and rejects in turn the suggestions that the various religious changes of the century, and what he considers their unique result, are to be accounted for by national character, human personality, and original religious need (*Not*). Rather he suggests that the frequent variations in the governmental policy with respect to religion, caused by the exigencies of diplomacy or the differences in the attitudes of Henry's successors, forced the religious question back upon the individual. The thirty years of confusion permitted the genuine Protestant influence (which, he convincingly reasons, came more from Luther than from Wycliffe) to secure a foothold among the people. But it also permitted other individuals to formulate other systems, and when in Elizabethan times the government did make the effort to enforce uniformity it was too late. The idea that religion was a matter on which the individual might form his own opinions had been too deeply implanted in the English character during the last generation to be eradicated.

In the course of thus setting forth their theories the two writers are betrayed by them and by their points of view into an interesting clash of opinion. Constant, anxious to emphasize the point that there was no great religious dissatisfaction with the old régime, insists upon the consistency of the theological policy of Henry VIII, which he maintains was uniformly Catholic throughout his lifetime. Any apparent variations were only for diplomatic effect. Schöffler, on the other hand, desirous of magnifying the vacillations of the government's religious policy, makes Henry out to have been very changeable indeed. As usual we are safe in concluding the truth lies between the extremes. Henry was no theological reformer, but neither was he so doctrinaire as to allow dogma to stand in the way of his attaining the desired personal and political ends.

All manner of questions are inevitably raised in the reader's mind by these works. Is there any particular virtue in tracing events to a single cause, or in emphasizing one cause to the exclusion of others? Would it not be better to remember with John Stuart Mill that, in practice, every effect is the product of many causes, several of which may be equally essential? Furthermore, is it correct to think of England as unique in its possession of a permanent religious opposition since the time of the Reformation? It is noteworthy that the work which advances this theory makes few references to the religious history of France. Finally, is it necessary to accept every apparent diversity as a fundamental one and to explain it as such? May it not be possible to solve the problem by the alternative method by discovering an underlying unity in the apparent diversity? Recent research, in fact that of Troeltsch to which Schöffler refers us, tends to emphasize the fundamental unity underlying the outlook of the pre- and post-Reformation churches, whether Catholic or

Protestant. Surely this is true in the important field of social and economic teaching, as Tawney and his student Kraus have so well pointed out. Furthermore the men of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries themselves often had great difficulty in distinguishing between the Puritan and the Anglican. Too long have we labored under the delusion that differences based upon ecclesiastical organization and theological technicalities are fundamental ones. Rather than always seeing the sixteenth-century churchmen as sharply divided into self-conscious parties, is it not well for the intellectual historian occasionally to remember how they all stood together against "the profane" who, as they do now, constituted more than half the populace of the time? Perhaps the philosopher most worth following in the question of the one and the many is the man who said, "All flows," and thus implied that under apparent differences there is always an underlying unity.

Meanwhile we await with interest the further contributions of these scholars. It is to be hoped that Professor Constant will be able to contribute the unspecified number of volumes necessary to complete his work, and that Professor Schöffler will see fit to deal with the subject of Puritanism as an intellectual force and particularly with its relations to the literature which he knows so well.

M. M. KNAPPEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Abraham Cowley. Sa vie, son œuvre. By JEAN LOISEAU. Paris: Henri Didier, 1931. Pp. xvii+715.

Abraham Cowley's Reputation in England. By JEAN LOISEAU. Pp. viii+221.

These two closely packed volumes, totaling well over nine hundred pages in length, furnish new evidence that honors for thoroughness in literary investigation and criticism no longer reside in Germany or even in America, but in France. M. Loiseau, in this stupendous Sorbonne dissertation, has collected, it would seem, everything that has been written or printed about Abraham Cowley from 1618 to 1931. In addition, since M. Loiseau's plan calls for a complete placing of his author in both his literary and his social milieus (not to speak of his political, scientific, philosophical, and even geographic ones), the result is a pretty exhaustive commentary on seventeenth-century life and thought as well as on the impression which these have made upon later generations. The task was a huge one, but M. Loiseau has carried it through extremely well, always keeping in mind his prospective audience of specialists. For the book is of course one for scholars—a reference work for the person who wishes to know about Cowley the man and the "metaphysical poet" in general, or about his prosody, his religion, or the reasons for his disfavor with Charles II in particular.

The method of the study calls for a division, in the first volume (written in French), into (1) the biography proper, and (2) the works—the latter section

being subdivided into (a) the thought and (b) the art, which itself is divided into (i) the genres and (ii) the technique. This scheme, it will be observed, calls for an examination and a re-examination of the writings from several points of view; and the critic is continually forced to turn the same material over and over, holding it up in different lights and subjecting it to new tests, until he has completely understood its texture, its beauty, and its probable durability. It is fortunate, indeed, that M. Loiseau possesses the power of analytical discrimination which one habitually associates with French criticism, or this method would prove disastrous to the reader's patience. In the second volume (written in English), the plan is the natural chronological one, each of the seven main sections and the conclusion being divided into two parts: (1) Cowley's readers and (2) his critics. This scheme is fairly satisfactory, although a further division of the second body of material according to the different genres which M. Loiseau has himself distinguished would have somewhat clarified the working up and stating of his summaries in each chapter; for any discussion of such a self-contradictory matter as Cowley's reputation demands a careful separation of one group of his writings from another.

It is inevitable, perhaps, that even when two biographers are working from virtually the same body of material they will find themselves at variance on some points. Happily, M. Loiseau and I disagree on few questions of fundamental importance. Our views of Cowley's writing and life are, on the whole, the same, although, on the side of the former, M. Loiseau's central thesis of displaying his author as a follower, as a thorough moderate in all things, tends to detract somewhat more from that author's originality than he deserves, and, on the side of the latter, his picture tends to idealize Cowley's character in several of its aspects, by failing to weigh all the evidence completely. For instance, he refuses to consider the possibility of Cowley's having actually meant his recantation after he was swept into prison by Cromwell's dragnet. The facts in themselves might point in either direction. But what about the poems written during that distressing period? M. Loiseau does not realize their implications, for if he did he could not fail to see that Cowley either meant to desert the Royalist cause or else that he was an extremely smooth hypocrite—and neither view harmonizes with his conception of the poet's character. This is perhaps the reason why he treats the *Davideis* as almost entirely the work of an *écolier*, overlooking the fact that most of Book IV seems to have been written about 1655 and that much of the remainder of the epic must have been revised before it was printed.¹

Similarly, the opinion that Cowley could never have been in love, and that the thin plot running through *The Mistress* was purely imaginary, seems untenable. M. Loiseau himself quotes his author's remark many years later that

¹ Loiseau's contention that the *Davideis* was influenced by Fairfax's translation of Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata* remains, to me, unproved, although he seems to be supported by Mario Pras. But, whether or not Cowley was familiar with Fairfax's work, Loiseau is at least not betrayed into concluding therefore that Cowley knew Italian, as Praz seems to be in his review of my book in *English Studies*, XIV (1932), 34-35.

"if I were to fall in love again (which is a great passion, and therefore I hope I have done with it), it would be, I think, with prettiness rather than majestic beauty." Moreover, he overlooks Joshua Barnes's testimony (*quod ex certa relatione accepimus*). This error makes him overstress Cowley's platonic attitude toward the "matchless Orinda" as the only woman the poet was ever attracted to, whereas Philip Souers' recent biography of Mrs. Philipps shows definitely that the two were never more than literary acquaintances. This supposition underlies the entire discussion of Cowley's attitude toward women.

Other less important reservations concern M. Loiseau's refusal to admit that Cowley's brother Thomas could have been both a stationer and Clerk of the Cheque at Deptford, although circumstantial evidence from Pepys' diary and other records makes this conclusion very likely; his date for Cowley's retirement to Barn-Elms, which seems too early; and his failure to note the fact that Cowley's miscellaneous poems seem to have been printed in the chronological order of their composition—a circumstance which makes the application and interpretation of several somewhat different from his. One wonders, too, why the *Vision* was first published under an assumed name and later anonymously if it heralded Cowley's intention of becoming a pamphleteer in the royal cause and of thus regaining his lost favor. The statement that the Porch House at Chertsey still stands is, I suggest, a mistake—at least if a letter to me from the librarian of the public library there, dated November 30, 1928, may be believed, since it contains the following sentence: "The whole of the old building has, within the last two years, been pulled down and there is now a row of shops on the site!" Moreover, it must have been some misreading of my MS which led M. Loiseau to say that I date the petition for the Savoy appointment at the beginning of 1663, since it clearly belongs a year or two earlier.²

But these trivial defects, together with a few inescapable typographical errors, such as the consistent misprinting of *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis* as *Trenodia Cantabrigiensis*, and certain inconsistencies in the mechanics of composition, such as the wavering between the original and the translated forms of titles and quotations, are far outweighed by solid discoveries in fact and by the critical faculty before described. These biographical discoveries are especially valuable when they have to do with Cowley's school days—for M. Loiseau himself went to live at Trinity College, Cambridge, exactly as his author had done—and with his activities during the Commonwealth. The discussions of such matters as the Pindaric ode are often illuminating. But perhaps the treatment of Cowley's style as both a verse and a prose writer is the most interesting.

Those critics who have called Cowley's later prose style the direct antithesis of the verse, Loiseau insists, are clearly at fault, since an analysis of the two shows that they have virtually the same elements in common. At the

² See pp. 196–98 of my *Abraham Cowley*.

basis of all Cowley's poetry is the belief that thought, or the intellectual operation, is the skeleton, whereas ornamentation is the flesh which conceals and beautifies this framework but nevertheless depends upon it for its form and ultimate value. Consequently, style is to him a matter of extreme care and labor, Johnson and other critics to the contrary notwithstanding. Of course, a certain amount of unevenness in the results of applying this principle must be admitted—an unevenness which might well have been attributed partly to Cowley's own frequent dissatisfaction with the "conceited" style, as he confessed it in many of his poems. As for the prose, Cowley employs both the concise and the rhetorical styles according to his desires and his aims, but the elements of both have always been present in his poetry; the whole question is merely one of proportion. Moreover, in the essays and similar passages in other works, the personal element is as important as the actual style in determining the final effect of the writing. "Et c'est bien la différence des genres qui accentue à l'excès, ici, la différence des styles." The salient trait in the poetry is excess; in the prose, moderation. Loiseau attributes the latter quality, with its greater simplicity and regularity, partly to Cowley's French studies, partly to the influence of such English theorists as Jonson, Davenant, and Hobbes, and partly to the new scientific movement, which, as summed up later in the Royal Society, demanded a change from the old rhetoric so far as practical and scientific subjects were concerned. In this discussion Loiseau might perhaps have made more of the influence of Cowley's own personality, as well as of his epistolary style; nevertheless, he carefully and wisely refrains from tracing the entire development to a single source, such as the Royal Society alone, as has recently been done.³

Through such analyses as these, and through the interpretative biography, the picture of Cowley the man, the poet, and the thinker emerges in three dimensions. It is this emphasis on the whole man as much as on the "metaphysical poet" which is characteristic of the new and modern attitude toward Abraham Cowley.

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Baron de Lahontan: Dialogues curieux entre l'auteur et un sauvage de bon sens qui a voyagé et Mémoires de l'Amérique septentrionale. Publiés par GILBERT CHINARD. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; Paris: A. Margraff; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1931. Pp. 268.

The importance of Lahontan's *Dialogues* and of the greater part of the *Mémoires*, reprinted in this handsome volume from the French edition of 1703, is well known to all students of the history of ideas in the eighteenth

³ Cf. R. F. Jones, "Science and English Prose Style in the Third Quarter of the Seventeenth Century," *PMLA*, XLV (1930), 977-1009, and my reply, "Concerning Cowley's Prose Style," *ibid.*, XLVI (1931), 962-65.

century. The spirited attack on civilized man and his institutions which is found in them not only affords an excellent view of the state of skeptical thought at the beginning of the eighteenth century, but also provides a storehouse of primitivistic doctrine as it had developed from the ancients down to Lahontan's own day. Professor Chinard has, therefore, earned the gratitude of all students of the *mouvement philosophique* for making these texts readily accessible and for contributing, in addition, a useful and stimulating commentary on them. The introduction of seventy-two pages includes a short account of Lahontan's career, a description of the French and the English editions of 1703 and of Gueudeville's contribution to the *Dialogues* of 1705, and a thoroughgoing discussion of Lahontan's influence on various eighteenth-century writers.

Studies like this last are indubitably among the most treacherous that the student of literary history can undertake. There is an almost irresistible temptation to overlook the fact that most of the ideas in the *Dialogues* and the *Mémoires* had been current for centuries and to regard them as the unique source of much of the thinking of the eighteenth century and especially, when estimating the influence of Lahontan on a given writer, to rely uncritically on parallel texts. Professor Chinard makes it clear that he is well aware of these pitfalls; and the result is that, on the whole, he is as discriminating and wary a guide as one might wish for. One comes away from his introduction and from this section of it in particular more strongly convinced of Lahontan's widespread influence than ever before. The numerous editions through which the works passed, the translations of them into English, Dutch, and Italian, the mention of Lahontan by such writers as Leibniz, Lafitau, Diderot, Chateaubriand, and others—all show unmistakably that Lahontan's impression on the eighteenth century was immediate and lasting.

And yet the very success of this study as a whole throws its few shortcomings all the more strongly into relief. These are especially noticeable in the discussion which attempts to show that Swift was definitely inspired by Lahontan in Part IV of *Gulliver's Travels*. Relying on parallel texts, since Swift nowhere mentions the French voyager, Professor Chinard arrives at the conviction that "il est difficile d'admettre que Swift n'ait pas eu entre les mains l'ouvrage de Lahontan" (p. 62). It would indeed be difficult to think otherwise if the statements which parallel Swift's bore the marks of Lahontan's invention. They are, however, for the most part, simply a rephrasing of ideas widely disseminated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and available to Swift through various channels. For example, the first parallel given (p. 60), and to Professor Chinard one of the most striking of all, concerns the remarks of Lahontan and of Gulliver on salt:

Chose assez curieuse, les Houyhnhnms ne connaissent pas l'usage du sel et Gulliver, après avoir souffert de cette privation pendant les premiers temps de son séjour, arrive bientôt à la conclusion que l'emploi du sel n'a été introduit que pour pousser à boire, car, ajoute-t-il, *we observe no animal to be fond of it except man*.

C'est là une affirmation en contradiction flagrante avec ce que nous savons du prix que les peuplades primitives attachent au sel, et les commentateurs de Swift n'ont pas manqué de faire remarquer que les animaux eux-mêmes fréquentent les marais salés. ... D'autre part Lahontan, seul de tous les voyageurs que je connaisse, affirme précisément dans ses *Mémoires* que les Sauvages attribuent à l'usage du sel la plupart des maladies dont nous souffrons et ne peuvent y toucher sans souffrir d'une soif intense.

The fact is that voyagers to New France had repeatedly pointed out that the Indians despised salt (see Jacques Cartier, *Certaine Voyages Containing the Discoverie of the Gulfe of Saint Laurence, 1534-40*, in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*, VIII [1904], 233; André Thevet, *Les Singularitez de la France antarctique* [1558], reprint, ed. Paul Gaffarel [Paris, 1878], pp. 147-48; Marc Lescarbot, *The History of New France* [1609], trans. and ed. W. L. Grant [Toronto], II (1911), 118; III (1914), 30-31, 171-72; F. Gabriel Sagard, *Le grand Voyage du pays des Hurons* [1632], reprint [Paris, 1865], pp. 67-68, 101; Paul le Jeune, *Relation of What Occurred in New France in the Year 1634*, reprinted in *The Indians of North America*, selected from the *Jesuit Relations* and ed. Edna Kenton [New York, 1927], I, 170; Francesco G. Bressani, *A Brief Account of Certain Missions . . . in New France* [1653], *ibid.*, II, 29, 30; and an anonymous *Relation of What Occurred . . . in New France in the Years 1657 & 1658*, *ibid.*, pp. 110 and 112). Sagard, for example, wrote (p. 101), "Après que tout est fait, chacun se retire sans boire; car ... ne mangent-ils rien de trop salé ou espicé. ..." Again he wrote (pp. 67-68):

Il est vray qu'on passe d'ordinaire les semaines et les mois entiers sans boire: car ne mangeant iamaïs rien de salé ny espicé ... et nous nous trouuions fort-bien de ne point manger de sel. ... Et à mon retour en Canada, ie me trouuois mal au commencement d'en manger, pour l'auoir discontinué trop long temps; ce qui me faict croire que le sel n'est pas necessaire à la conseruation de la vie, ny à la santé de l'homme.

Nor were the Hurons the only people known to avoid it. The Icelanders, Arngrimur Jonas observed, enjoyed health and long life principally because they refused to use all "varitie of sauce" and salt, the "provocation of glut-tony" (*A Briefe Commentarie of Island*, written in 1593 and printed in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*, IV [1904], 188).

Other parallels are, regrettably, no less disappointing:

Comme les Indiens, les Houyhnhnms croient que les vêtements que portent les Européens leur servent avant tout à dissimuler leurs déformités. ... Comme Adario, le Houyhnhnm frémit quand on lui décrit les instruments perfectionnés que les Européens ont inventés pour se tuer. Comme Adario ... il considère que la monnaie est la cause de la plupart des maux dont souffrent les Européens. ... Surtout, comme les sauvages de Lahontan ils ont une raison naturelle qui les dirige de telle sorte que leur vertu consiste comme l'avait dit Bierling en une ignorance du vice ... [pp. 60-61].

These observations are commonplaces in the various attacks by Renaissance moralists on civilized man. When, to cite only one example, Walter Hamond,

surgeon to the East India Company, described, in 1640, the admirable characteristics of the natives of Madagascar he used precisely these ideas as among the chief pegs on which to hang his discussion (*A Paradox: Proving the Inhabitants of . . . Madagascar . . . To Be the Happiest People in the World*, reprinted in *The Harleian Miscellany*, I [1808], 263-69). Curiously enough, the idea stressed by Bierling, an eighteenth-century critic of Lahontan, is to Professor Chinard so striking that he mentions it twice, declaring (p. 54) "... ces barbares ... 'ignorent les vices plutôt qu'ils ne connaissent la vertu,' et voici déjà sous la plume du professeur allemand une définition que Jean-Jacques, cinquante ans plus tard aurait pu appliquer à l'homme tel qu'il est sorti des mains de la nature." This definition, as a matter of fact, is as old as Seneca, who applied it to the innocent peoples of the Golden Age (see *Epistulae*, XC). Justin, also, in his abridgment of Trogus Pompeius, wrote of the Scythians, those "noble savages" of the ancients: "So much better effect has the ignorance of vice in the one people [the Scythians] than the knowledge of virtue in the other [the Greeks]" (*Historiae Philippicae* ii. 2, trans. the Rev. John S. Watson [London, 1853]; see also the reference to Justin in Grotius, *The Rights of War and Peace* [1625], trans. A. C. Campbell [New York, 1901], p. 87, and the distinction between "Goodness, or Innocence" and "Virtue" in Charron, *Of Wisdom* [1601], trans. George Stanhope [London, 1729], II, 691). Furthermore, Lahontan's reference to the *raison naturelle* of the Hurons and Swift's famous description of the Houyhnhnms' reliance on unerring reason "not mingled, obscured, or discoloured by passion and interest" should be thought of as reflections of a tradition in European thought extending over many centuries.

It is not, therefore, easy to attach very much importance to parallels such as these unless one is prepared to believe that Lahontan was to English writers in the early eighteenth century the fountainhead of most of the critical and skeptical thought of the past. This is an error in historical perspective which Professor Chinard does not wholly escape, despite his avowed wish to do so (pp. 2-3). It seems to account, in part, for his willingness to rely on textual resemblances in the case of Swift and also for the assertion that a detailed comparison of Lahontan with Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke, and Pope "permettrait sans doute de rendre à César ce qui est à César ou, si l'on aime mieux, au diable ce qui est au diable" (p. 47). And it is apparent in the reasons given for finding no trace of the French voyager's direct influence on Goldsmith, "malgré des parallélismes frappants" (p. 62). After pointing out that Lahontan's works do not occur in the list of books owned by Goldsmith, Professor Chinard goes on to explain that the "ressemblances que l'on pourrait signaler peuvent et doivent simplement s'expliquer par le fait que bien des idées exprimées par Lahontan, après avoir été reprises par maints auteurs, étaient devenues propriété commune et étaient entrées dans ce fond général qui constitue la philosophie dite du xviii^e siècle." No one, of course, would seriously deny that the vogue of ideas similar to those expressed by Lahon-

tan was greater in Goldsmith's time than in 1726. And yet the fact is that these ideas were far more widely diffused in the Restoration and the early eighteenth century and far more accessible in numerous sources than Professor Chinard apparently thinks. It is reasonably certain, for example, that Swift could have written as he did had Lahontan never existed.

R. W. FRANTZ

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Studies in Balzac's Realism. By E. PRESTON DARGAN, W. L. CRAIN, and OTHERS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. Pp. xi+213.

This volume, the third in a series of "University of Chicago Studies in Balzac," is a fragment of the most concerted and scholarly work in progress today on the author of the Human Comedy. It will command attention from students of nineteenth-century French literature; and, in view of its thesis, will provoke criticism. An introductory chapter, outlining "what are usually accepted as the components of realistic technique," is an elaboration of two articles by E. Preston Dargan which appeared in this journal.¹ The succeeding chapters embody an application of Professor Dargan's realistic "qualities and devices" to a chronological series of novels, beginning with *Les Chouans* and ending with *Le Cousin Pons*. The conclusions reached would seem to answer affirmatively the vital question which is raised: Was Balzac essentially a realist?

No one can fail to be impressed with the sterling value of Professor Dargan's introductory chapter on Balzac's general method, wherein he has controlled a vast expanse of critical data, has devised a careful list of features ascribable to realistic fiction in general, and has suggested how closely Balzac will affirm these features: materialistic outlook, impersonality of treatment, scientific approach, technical or encyclopedic intention, documentary method. These qualities are indisputably evident in the Human Comedy, just as they are evident in the fiction of a George Eliot, a Flaubert, or a Hardy. But, if realism is a genuinely artistic technique, as I believe it to be, we must regret the addition to the above list of such inartistic elements as tediousness, pedantry, or long-windedness. Such qualities ought to be associated, not with realistic fiction, but with bad fiction. I question also whether Professor Dargan may not give rise to confusion by stressing "truth" as the basis of all realistic fiction, although I heartily agree with the statement.² The purpose of any good fiction, whether realistic or romantic, is conformity to the truth, and one might argue with some warmth that both *Quatre-Vingt-Treize* and *Le Chevalier Des Touches* are just as splendidly truthful in their vision of life

¹ "Studies in Balzac: II. Critical Analysis of Realism," XVI (November, 1918), 351-70; "III. His General Method," XVII (July, 1919), 113-24.

² Confusion actually arises later (p. 99), when this abstraction is defined as a "close correspondence with reality."

as *Les Chouans*, although they are certainly less realistic. The glib catchphrase that "truth is stranger than fiction" is no valid one, as Clayton Hamilton pointed out years ago,³ and the distinction which a cautious critic must make is between fact (actuality) and fiction. Balzac himself was thoroughly aware of these divergent phenomena when, stressing the imaginative qualities of his novels, he referred to them as "augustes mensonges." "La matérialité d'un fait n'en constitue pas la vérité."⁴ Actuality is not a synonym of truth, and a striking example of the confusion of terms occurs in the study on *La Peau de chagrin* where the author argues for Balzac's realistic intent on the grounds that actualities (the Venus of Milo, a first-aid inspector mentioned by name, Rossini's *Tancred*, etc.) are introduced at every page.

To return to the components of realism as they are formulated in the initial chapter, we are led to wonder whether they are inclusive enough to justify fully the art of Balzac. One hesitates to assign to a great artist merely those qualities which were taken over and practiced by a self-conscious school of writers who succeeded him. Balzac seems to us today much more genuinely a "realist" than do the Champfleury's and the Duranty's of the 1850's for whom the term was merely synonymous with vulgarity and materialism; and yet this volume does not clearly mark out these distinctions. I shall not labor the point, although I may be permitted to express the hope that the Chicago group will be tempted, later, to extend their realistic compass beyond the tenets of the "school" to some more comprehensive view, making realism a genuinely artistic form, which should produce "a vivid reflection of the world we know and live in, from every side that our intuition or experience can grasp."⁵ This would allow for the full play of Balzac's remarkable intuitive gifts, as well as for the artist's subtle choice and arrangement of reality, producing in us, as Faguet says,⁶ "the same impression which the real itself produces, *only more strongly*." For Professor Dargan's discriminating values, however, let us be truly thankful. They are keen, and they are provocative.

The applications of the theory fall short in two respects: they tend to depart too radically from the initial thesis, thereby detracting from the unity of the volume; or else they follow it too blindly.

In two of the studies—those on *Les Chouans* and *La Maison du chat qui pelote*—realism is gauged by the fidelity with which Balzac follows historical fact; and, as if to sustain further the realistic intent of the novelist, careful

³ *Materials and Methods of Fiction* (1908), p. 2, wherein he defines a novel as a series of imagined facts and imaginary characters that are true (p. 1). The worth of any good fiction, says Wilson Follett (*The Modern Novel*, [1923], p. 65), is "contingent on the fulness and truth of the vision of life": "that glimpse of truth for which you had forgotten to ask" (*The Nigger of the Narcissus*).

⁴ A remark made by an inspector of prisons a propos of the Peytel case; cited by F. Baldensperger, *Orientations étrangères chez Balzac* (1927), p. 263.

⁵ Arthur McDowall, *Realism: A Study in Art and Thought* (1918), p. 24; a volume which contains the finest and most comprehensive definition of realism that I know: "The sense of actual existence; an acute awareness of it, and a vision of things under that form" (p. 3).

⁶ Balzac (1913), p. 137.

search is made for flesh-and-blood prototypes. In this latter, the authors of these two monographs are following the lead, not of E. Preston Dargan, but of Maurice Serval, an indefatigable searcher after "originals" of characters and sites—an interest which lies quite apart from the quest of realistic qualities. An accurate recording of history does not constitute realism. Works of fiction, as Robert Louis Stevenson was wont to say, "repeat, rearrange, clarify the lessons of life." They cannot be measured by the fidelity with which a fictionist utilizes a factual situation; and this, we feel, was one of the blunders committed by those latter-day romantics, the Goncourts and Zola. In the study on *Le Curé de Tours*, the "topography" of the novel has been accounted for in a thoroughgoing manner; but I cannot see that the fidelity with which Balzac utilized an actual house is any measure of his realism. The author of the essay finds a certain confusion in the topographical description, and attributes it to the fact that the novel was written at Saint-Firmin rather than at Tours. This seems not only a feeble argument but an instant denial of the one supreme gift which Balzac possessed: his imagination. We know that the house of Balthasar Claës did not stand in Douai; no house in Saumur ever corresponded to Grandet's; yet this knowledge does not spoil the feeling of reality which is imparted by Balzac's descriptions of these houses. One wishes that the author of this study of *Le Curé de Tours* had devoted much less space to topography and had centered her attention on the full-bodied realism with which this splendid novel is saturated: the sociological problem—What manner of people can live under the shadow of a cathedral?—fused artistically with the psychological problem—What manner of lives do celibates live? In the three studies mentioned above, the authors appear, therefore, to have departed somewhat from the general scheme which is outlined in the opening chapter.

When the Chicago group follows the general scheme too closely, difficulties also arise. For example, one claim which is made for Balzacian realism is the novelist's reduction of human features, passions, and desires to corresponding terms in lower animals—his comparisons of men to animals. But, in *La Peau de chagrin*, when Fédora is likened to a cat which allows itself to be caressed with "unbelievable abandon," or when Raphaël casts himself upon Pauline with the swiftness of a bird of prey, I feel that such effusions strengthen the inherent romanticism of a novel the plot of which this essayist acknowledges to be a "wild allegory." Again, when Balzac indulges in the reverse process to "animalism"—that is to say, when he vivifies inanimate objects—he is merely utilizing a very old romantic trick much practiced by Hugo and Zola. The "animation" of the *turgotine* or the *château* in *Les Chouans*, or of the antique shop in *La Peau de chagrin*, remind one of the very romantic cannon which breaks its moorings in *Quatre-Vingt-Treize*, or the voracious coal mines in *Germinal*.

The sociological features, which Professor Dargan rightly points out as constituting one of Balzac's claims as realist, are in the main dwelt upon with

fairness and precision; yet, in *Les Chouans*, when the sociological preoccupation is proved by the influence of the national situation upon "such phenomena as hurried love-making and a general stimulation of the passions" (pp. 56-57), the argument approaches absurdity.

The chapters on *Eugénie Grandet* and *Le Cousin Pons* do not attain the level of the other essays: the former, because of a certain narrow approach to the full sweep of Balzacian realism which is encountered in this novel; the latter, because of its lack of clarity in expression. Here, again, the collaborator departs sadly from Professor Dargan's tenets, advancing as proofs of realism: the absence of romanticism,⁷ and Balzac's unintelligible philosophical peregrinations. Nor would Professor Dargan agree with this member of his group in stating that the essential object of realism is "to put fiction on the same plane as actual life" (p. 210). What this essayist has really found in *Le Cousin Pons* is a very bad piece of fiction, not particularly a realistic one. Perhaps such was his intention, after all, for the aim of his monograph is not particularly clear. On the other hand, the study of *Le Père Goriot* is the best: a finely conceived essay which makes this novel the realistic focus of the Human Comedy, which convinces one, with no servile use of a prearranged scheme, of the outstanding realistic technique of Balzac: a materialism that has a "personal force," a scientific conception of man as essentially an animal, and a monumental construction of dramatic scenes. "It is upon the reality of life as he [Balzac] sees it that he insists at once; and whether his truth is classical, romantic, or realistic, it is first of all Balzacian." This is an excellent statement and a broader approach to the art of Balzac.

In any volume compiled by various contributors, unevenness is difficult to avoid. Here, rough stylistic contours rear their heads on many pages, to such an extent that one wishes the general editor might have held his volume in store until a careful revision of each section was effected, with a view to the solidity of the whole. One study—that on *Le Cousin Pons*—might then even have been deleted; while the monograph on *Eugénie Grandet* might have been considerably reinforced. A much-needed index of titles and proper names might have been added, and, most assuredly, stylistic blemishes such as the following would have been rectified: "pumping people on every occasion" (p. 38); "an intense extreme character" (p. 125); "the last unction" (p. 127); "the period of no or slight regulation" (p. 157); "he tweaks Anselme's hair affectionately" (p. 171); "this splitting of a single thread . . . that forbids to the second part the simplicity of the first" (p. 196); "emphasis upon a thing as factoring actively among the determinants of human destiny" (p. 206); "a quite parallel tendency" (p. 211). There is an irritating introduction of untranslated French words: "her final *travestissement* and self-sacrifice" (p. 36); "several landscape *morceaux* . . . the feeling of anxious expectation or *attente*" (p. 59); "a horse voice which can strengthen [*sic*] to a *rugissement*"

⁷ "We are so far removed from romanticism in *Pons* that here is not a single character who has not his repulsive side."

(p. 61); "a part of the *étude de mœurs* approach" (p. 122); "she would have made a good *vraisemblable monomaniac*" (p. 161); "that is certainly *le comble de Pons*" (p. 195).

Attention should be called to a few minor corrections such as (on p. 121): (1) "in this edition [i.e., 1843] chapter-headings were omitted." This suggests that they were not omitted previously. In the Charpentier edition (1839) all chapter-headings, except a "Conclusion," were omitted. (2) *Madame de Surville*: the particle should be deleted. (3) "The confusion of this and other Marias with the Virgin Mary." We have no proof that the dedication of *Eugénie Grandet* suggests the Virgin Mary; nor that Balzac, who addressed a great many ladies of his acquaintance as Marie (Mesdames d'Abrantès, de Castries, among others) was accustomed to confuse them with the Virgin. (4) "The manuscript of *Eugénie Grandet* was presented to Mme Hanska in December, 1833." For precision, let us say, December 24, 1833, birthday of Mme Hanska. One very confusing error occurs on page 24 in a title-heading, where "Fictional Elements" is an evident misprint for "Technical Elements."

This volume suffers somewhat from lack of sureness in definition and from exaggeration in the application of a theory. In evolving a general idea of realism, the Chicago group has occasionally "failed to see the forest for the trees." These criticisms, however, should not cloud the light of Professor Dargan's initial thesis which is so convincingly wrought, nor detract from the patient workmanship of his followers in their construction of an original and stimulating contribution to the knowledge of the art of Balzac.

WALTER SCOTT HASTINGS

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Norsk Riksmåls-Ordbok. Edited by TRYGVE KNUDSEN and ALF SOMMERFELT. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1930—.

The chaotic condition of the Norwegian language in recent years has made the path of the lexicographer a thorny one. Not only has he had to contend with two distinct linguistic forms, the *Landsmål* or New Norse, and the *Riksmål* or Dano-Norwegian, but within each of these a kaleidoscopic succession of changing forms have made his work of yesterday antiquated overnight. But now that at least the Dano-Norwegian seems to have attained something more than a temporary stability in the generally accepted orthography of 1917, work on more comprehensive dictionaries is gaining impetus. A national dictionary, comprising the entire recorded vocabulary of the nation, is being projected. *Norsk Riksmåls-Ordbok*, of which six sections have reached this country (*A-efterligne*), is a less ambitious effort to satisfy the need for a popular modern dictionary of the Dano-Norwegian literary language with definitions in the original. Altogether it is intended to consist of thirty sections, comprised in two volumes of at least a thousand pages each. The edi-

tors are two of the best-known younger philologists of Norway, whose names are an ample guaranty of careful and conscientious editing. The advance it makes over its best predecessor, Brynildsen's *Norsk-Engelsk Ordbog*, is illustrated by the fact that the portion of the vocabulary contained in the first 414 pages of the new dictionary is treated by Brynildsen in only 172 pages of about the same size.

This excellent work gains an interest beyond the purely linguistic by virtue of its voluminous citation of usage. Nearly every word is accompanied by quotations, often as many as fifty or more, from modern Norwegian literature. Here we may gain a bird's-eye view of Norwegian literature from Wergeland and Welhaven to the present. In this panorama it is only just that Henrik Ibsen should loom the largest; a rapid count is sufficient to assure us that at least half the quotations are taken from his works. The practical reason for this liberality, the existence of a complete Ibsen-concordance, does not detract from the justice of the editor's view that Ibsen's writing "is in the highest degree representative of the language of this period." In his hands Dano-Norwegian attained its classic form. He did not concern himself with linguistic experiments, and was not like Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson an innovator and a revolutionary. But he caught the accent of cultivated Norwegian city speech and rendered it faithfully. The rapid development of the written language in the direction of the vernacular, while reflected by Ibsen, is more evident in later writers, whose works have not here been neglected. Such authors as Hans Aanrud, Mikkjel Fønhus, Johan Bojer, Gabriel Scott, and Hans Kinck have drawn heavily on their local country and city dialects and thereby increased enormously the appeal and the expressiveness of their cherished *Riksmål*. The list of books excerpted is instructive for the effort it shows to represent the various parts of the country and various types of literature. Here the massive novels of Sigrid Undset and the more playful works of Knut Hamsun rub shoulders with the delicate essays of Nils Kjør and the vivid narrative of Fridtjof Nansen. The editors have drawn also on the contemporary press and often on their knowledge of current colloquial usage. The result is a fascinating image of a living language, with older authors considered chiefly for those elements which have survived into the present. The quotations helpfully supply us with those nuances and connotations which mere definitions would be powerless to suggest.

The mechanics of the dictionary are also commendable. The text is readable and more conveniently arranged than most previous Norwegian dictionaries. Indications of pronunciation and etymology are valuable, although less frequent than might be desired.

EINAR HAUGEN

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

and
tan
Pro
of
lori
I c
Pro
the
"N
2, p
ind
dist
pro
con
the
exp
whi
hou
is n
relle
n. 3
mig
Bar
my
rem

I
not
of D
Wor
stat
I
valu
as a
with
ploy

BRIEFER MENTION

It is altogether gratifying to see the *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* continue to maintain their traditional erudition and importance. The latest volume, the thirteenth (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931; pp. 332), has eleven articles on subjects as diverse as the sources of Ælfric's saints' lives, Shrove Tuesday football, various medieval and folkloristic subjects, English literature in Russia, and Lessing's correspondence. I cannot comment on all these articles here. B. J. Whiting's "Origin of the Proverb" (pp. 47-80) is an exhaustive review of what can be learned about the beginnings of proverbs. He would have done well to consult Kalén, "Några utbyggda ordstäv," *Folkmonnen och Folktankar*, Vol. XII (1925), No. 2, pp. 27-38, in regard to those proverbs which assign themselves to a particular individual by using the formula "quoth Pedley." Such proverbs represent a distinct species which must be considered for itself. Whiting's thesis that proverbs arise by a "creative process of the folk" and are not the work of a conscious literary artist leads us into highly controversial territory, although the dispute has not hitherto dealt with proverbs. I cannot see how we can explain "New brooms sweep clean" as anything but a housewife's epigram which tradition has accepted. It is a question of one's preference whether the housewife or tradition has "created" the proverb, for if either is absent, there is no proverb. Powell Jones surveys the possible interrelations of the *pastourelle* and French folk drama (pp. 129-63). Since he gives references (pp. 156 f., n. 3) on the origin and antiquity of the game "Three Knights of Spain," he might have mentioned the convenient survey of the subject in Yrjö Hirn, *Barnlek* (Helsingfors, 1916), pp. 376-77. Such details as I mention show only my interest and must not be looked upon as anything more than the side-remarks of the attentive reader.—A. T.

If the contributions which Greek has made to the English vocabulary are not fully recognized in future histories of the language, it will not be the fault of Dr. John C. Smock, whose labors in collecting *The Greek Element in English Words* have been completed by Dr. Percy W. Long and are embodied in a stately volume of over 600 pages (New York: Macmillan Co., 1931).

Dr. Smock's aim in making this compilation was twofold: to emphasize the value of the study of Greek, by exhibiting the place which it holds in English as a whole, and especially in scientific terminology, and to furnish scientists with the means of readily ascertaining what terms have already been employed. The 130,000 words thus assembled are recorded twice, first in the

order in which they appear in an English dictionary, with indication of the Greek element they contain, and again in the order of the Greek lexicon, showing the English words derived from, or based upon, the Greek word or combining form. For practical purposes this dual arrangement is sufficient, but it fails to bring out completely some of the important features of the Greek element in English, and swells both lists with words in which that element is very attenuated. It is certainly noteworthy that the suffixes *-ism*, *-ist*, *-istic*, and *-ize* have taken their place among the commonest in the language, but it is carrying the point to an extreme when such words as *absenteeism*, *Irishism*, *journalist*, *Bolshevistic*, *devitalize*, *Kruppize*, constitute a large proportion of the lists illustrating these formations. An advocate of the Latin element in English would be equally entitled to lay claim to such words as *phenomenal*, *branchiate*, or *bigamous*, by reason of the Latin ending. Equally extreme is the inclusion of so many chemical terms in *-ase*, and *-ose*, merely because they were originally suggested by *diastase* and *glucose*.

The aim which Dr. Smock had before him makes it natural that a very large proportion of the words in his lists lie altogether outside of the ordinary vocabulary of English. To make use of this work for a historical study of the subject, it would be necessary to work carefully through it, select those terms which have general currency, and deal with these in the light of the date at which they entered the language, and the part they have played in it. Down to a certain point, which could be settled by such an investigation, Latin was the medium through which every Greek word was normally transmitted. Over a score came in during the Old English period, and many were introduced into Middle English, frequently with French as a second intermediary. It would be interesting to see at what dates in the various sciences the direct use of the Greek lexicon began. For such a study Dr. Smock's lists provide copious material.

A valuable feature of the work is the frequent indication of the Greek authority for the particular word, and the dated list of Greek and Latin authors. One error which has crept into recent dictionaries has not been avoided, viz., the substitution of *melimēlon* for *mēlōmeli* (or perhaps a Doric *mālōmeli*) as the source of Portuguese *marmelo* and *marmelada*, 'marmalade.'—W. A. C.

A new edition or reissue of F. B. Gummere's *Germanic Origins* (New York, 1892) has long been needed. It has now appeared under the title *Founders of England* (New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1930), a mechanical reprint with numerous changes. The changes and additions we owe to Francis Peabody Magoun, Jr. They consist in the introduction of Gummere's own translations from Beowulf, in the modernization of references where older editions have been superseded by newer ones, and in fourteen pages (pp. 485-99) of supplementary notes which are intended to provide only a start for further reading. In so brief a space as the editor had at his disposal his freedom was necessarily

limited and any criticism of omissions would be ungracious. The new issue of this standard work is heartily welcome, and the editorial additions make it more useful.—A. T.

It is a pleasure to review a saga edited as Frank Stanton Cawley has edited *Hrafnkels Saga Freysgoða* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1932; pp. 1+82)—a brief interesting story, exquisitely printed, illustrated with a map, a drawing, and photographs, and supplied with annotations which leave no syntactical or lexicological riddle unsolved. Dare one say that students have it too easy nowadays, when every difficulty is smoothed away for them? I wholly admire the clear and complete exposition of the peculiarities of Old Icelandic style, although I prefer to treat these questions orally in the course of reading the text. The text itself is carefully established, mainly on the basis of Jakobson's edition of the *Austfirðinga Sögur*. The glossary is excellent and may be justly compared with that of Heusler's much admired *Zwei Isländergeschichten*. I do not understand why the author sometimes adds the corresponding Gothic words. They are often almost superfluous for etymological explanations, e.g., *binda*, *vátr*, or not at all instructive for the beginner, e.g., *ambátt*, *deyja*, *lýsa*. There is no reason for mentioning the Latin *paucus* under *fár*. In many cases where parallels from any language are lacking, illustrative examples from West Teutonic languages could have been profitably cited. Personally I have enjoyed especially the admirable pages on the problem of the Icelandic saga in general. I cannot but regret that one who writes so clearly has not devoted a few pages to the relation of this particular saga to history and especially to the curious religious practices that form its chief content. A short survey of law practice might have been useful for the student who approaches a saga text for the first time.—JAN DE VRIES.

Miss Lussky's translation of the fifth and latest edition of Walzel's *Deutsche Romantik* (Leipzig, 1923) makes available to English readers a standard guide to German Romanticism (*German Romanticism*, by Oscar Walzel, authorized translation from the German by Alma Elise Lussky [New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932; pp. x+314]). As is well known, the peculiar merits of Walzel's introduction lie in its presentation of the philosophical aspects of romanticism. By bringing it nearer to English readers, Miss Lussky has performed a very useful and commendable service. Although the book is not unduly long, translation was an arduous task and one rendered all the more difficult by the involved style and thought. Miss Lussky has fortunately employed fewer Germanisms than most translators. In particular, she has not sinned in the use of tenses. Yet some painful instances of a non-English use of "the" have maintained themselves in the passage from German into English. We can grant her "the young Goethe," although we

wink and swallow. It can be defended, and an American university offers a course under that title. "The Storm and Stress," however, will not down. Miss Lussky must not be blamed for some obscure sentences, for her German original leaves much to be desired on that score. It is regrettable that the charming lyrics used for illustration are replaced by prose translations, for the book appeals primarily to those who could best profit by having the original poetry before them and a translation in the notes.—CHESTER NATHAN GOULD.

Italian essays on Shelley have been fairly numerous within the last hundred years, but none has been so complete, so well documented, or so well written as Professor Michele Renzulli's *La poesia di Shelley* (Foligno e Roma: F. Campitelli, 1932). Based on the best of recent research and on a thoroughly independent study of Shelley's life, letters, and poetry, this study is unified by a sensitive understanding of the poet's egocentricity and of his genius which, although it goes below the surface presented by the documents, has nothing of Freudian extravagance or of romanticized imagination about it.

More perhaps might have been made of Shelley's continued interest in the social order—that interest is here accounted for chiefly by the poet's early debt to Godwin, whereas it should be seen also in its maturer phases—yet no one can complain of thinness in the volume as a whole. In fact, contrasted with Maurois' *Ariel*, which Professor Renzulli finds is in its basic facts the merest "audacious plagiarist" from Dowden (cf. p. 415), here is a balanced, complete, and vivid portrait which will seem convincingly truthful alike to general readers and to scholars.

The bibliography, which comments on most of the volumes entered, will be particularly useful to students, in spite of numerous printers' errors, especially in the German and English entries, e.g., *psychology* (p. 417), *revolutionary* (p. 439), *dechterthum* and *Beziehungen* (p. 426), and many other mistakes which should have been caught in proof.—WINIFRED SMITH.

Lyon N. Richardson's *A History of Early American Magazines, 1741-1789* (New York: Nelson, 1931; pp. 414) and Clarence L. F. Gohdes' *The Periodicals of American Transcendentalism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1931; pp. 264) are both useful intensive studies in hitherto neglected or only partially occupied fields. Dr. Gohdes' book breaks fresh ground; Dr. Richardson's develops in exhaustive detail the preliminary period in Mott's *History of American Magazines, 1741-1850*.

Dr. Richardson reveals in a brief, well-balanced opening chapter that he has a sense of the general aspects and values of the periodical literature in the period of his choice. From this and from the complete bibliography of the magazines under discussion the reader may gather the irreducible minimum of fact. There seem to have been no less than thirty-seven undertaken during the period; but so small was their circulation and so slender their revenue that

few survived infancy. Sixteen lived less than a year; ten less than two years, seven others, less than three years; three died under four years; and the leviathan and Methuselah of them all lived to be only eight. The majority explained in their secondary, descriptive titles that they intended to supplement the journals in their inclusion of foreign and domestic political news, their historical essays—frequently in serials designed for republication in book form—and their discussions of manufactures, trade, and commerce. A few included quite casually the words “amusement” and “entertainment.” Several were exclusively religious, one of these in German. The single children’s magazine lasted for only four issues. Most of them relied on scissors and paste-pot for much of their matter.

Two literary features emerge from an examination of them. One is the strong influence of the contemporary English poets and essayists. The allusions are frequent to Addison, Blair, Dryden, Goldsmith, Gray, Johnson, Milton, Pope, Richardson (though not to Fielding, Smollett, or Sterne), Steele, and Swift, and there are various excursions into criticism of English poetry, drama, and fiction. The other main feature is that during their short lives the magazines served as outlets to the leading American writers—not merely those whose reputations depended on magazine prestige, but those whose contributions lend the magazines distinction even at this distance. The list includes such men of letters as Joel Barlow, H. H. Brackenridge, Timothy Dwight, Benjamin Franklin, Francis Hopkinson, Philip Freneau, John Trumbull, and commentators on the American language like Noah Webster and John Witherspoon.

But the book is so full of detail that it is to be used more in the way of reference than for consecutive reading; and for this purpose it is completely equipped with the machinery of annotation, bibliography and index, an admirable piece of scholarship.

Dr. Gohdes’ study of the journalism of the Transcendentalists is equally informative at points, but by no means evenly informative. The *Dial*, by far the most significant of the periodicals, is hyphenated with the *Western Messenger* in the title of the second chapter, but is reduced to hardly more than a parenthesis even here. In contrast, this Cincinnati publication, the *Boston Quarterly*, the *Harbinger*, and the *Massachusetts Quarterly* are compendiously treated, while the *Radical* and the *Index*, two slight aftermaths of the movement, share one-sixth of the volume. This distribution of emphasis reveals an apparent reluctance of the author to come to grips with his material. Certainly in such a volume as this the *Dial* deserves complete historical and critical discussion, for G. W. Cooke’s voluminous treatise is not generally accessible. It does not receive a single page of Dr. Gohdes’ undivided attention. The same elusiveness of approach marks the introductory chapter, which starts with references to the indefiniteness and futility in later treatments of Transcendentalism and later attempts to define it, goes on to

illustrate these defects by the ensuing discussion, and ends with something between a leer and a sneer, capped by a timeworn allusion to Carlyle's dyspepsia.

This attitude, however, seems on further observation to arise more from temperament than from conscious choice. When Dr. Gohdes declares (p. 49), "After all, there is an undeniable connection between the attempt to uphold the idea of the divinity in man and the effort to better the conditions of the working classes and to abolish slavery," he betrays his failure to see that this connection exists not *after all*, but fundamentally and from the start. When he dismisses a mention of Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience* with the statement (p. 155) that "it contains its author's account of his imprisonment in the Concord Jail," he shows that he has forgotten the connection again, and that he is more impressed by a picturesque episode than by the principles involved in the voluntary imprisonment and the illustrative allusion to it in this momentous essay.

To the degree to which Dr. Gohdes' study assembles and presents hitherto scattered data about the periodicals of the Transcendentalists it is valuable. But as far as critical values go it reminds one of O. W. Holmes's comment on the Reverend Professor Bowen's review of *The American Scholar*, of which he said that the relation of the reviewer to his subject was about that of an intelligent pointer to a box-tortoise.—PERCY H. BOYNTON.

